



CDC-10110663

ANL

ANL MS -- MS 4985

Records of the Federal Secretariat of the Australian Labor Party,

MATTHEW BYRNE  
ALP  
DOCUMENT SUPPLY SERVICE  
5/9 Sydney Avenue  
Barton, ACT 2600  
Australia

ATTN: SUBMITTED: 2009-04-09 15:26:32  
PHONE: PRINTED: 2009-05-07 15:54:17  
FAX: REQUEST NO.: CDC-10110663  
E-MAIL: SENT VIA: Copies Direct  
EXTERNAL NO.: 31968  
PATRON TYPE: Copies Direct

---

CDC Core Copy Journal

---

AUTHOR: Australian Labor Party. Federal Secretariat.  
TITLE: RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL SECRETARIAT OF THE  
AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY, 1917-1988 [MANUSCRIPT].  
SUB TITLE: PI: NLA.MS-MS4985  
SPONSOR: Tel: 61200800 Email: matthew.byrne@cbr.alp.org.au  
DATE: 1917-1988.  
SOURCE: Source: Catalogue  
COPYRIGHT COMP.: Permission from Copyright Owner  
NOTES: Conditions Agreed. I will publish in Labor  
History website, official online history of the  
ALP ALP Notes: Box 117, Folder 24, Speech Cyril  
Wyndham Requirements: please only print as  
flagged

WARNING. This material has been provided to you pursuant to section 49 of  
the Copyright Act 1968 for the purpose of research or study. The content may  
be subject to copyright protection under the Act.

---

National Library of Australia ABN 28346858075



CDC-10110663

DELIVERY: E-mail Post to Web: [matthew.byrne@cbr.alp.org.au](mailto:matthew.byrne@cbr.alp.org.au)  
REPLY: E-mail: [matthew.byrne@cbr.alp.org.au](mailto:matthew.byrne@cbr.alp.org.au)

This document contains 19 pages. You will be invoiced for \$13.20. This is NOT an invoice.

Keep this tax receipt to reconcile your records. Note GST has not been charged for the supply of this material.

WARNING. This material has been provided to you pursuant to section 49 of the Copyright Act 1968 for the purpose of research or study. The content may be subject to copyright protection under the Act.

---

National Library of Australia ABN 28346858075

Madam President, Ladies.

The pleasure is mine to be here, indeed, I'm not giving of my time, you are giving of yours. And it's always a pleasure to come to Womens Conferences.

While other people usually deal with the important things like Vietnam, economic planning, housing, health, I'm left with the less important ones, such as organisation, promoting candidates, raising money, and so on. However, I gave some special thought as to what I should say today, because I felt it was time we said some of the new things, or not so new things; revived some of the old things, not to go back into the past but to do what Brian Chaseling suggested last night; Look into the future.

The remarkable thing about Brian Chaseling's address was evident, I'm sure, to you all. Twenty years ago the Public Relations Officer of the Bank of New South Wales would never have come near a Labor Party Conference. Equally so, a Labor Party Conference would never have had an address from the Public Relations Officer of the Bank of New South Wales. This is an indication of changing

Address by Cyril S. WYNNDHAM  
 on 1st October, 1968

FEDERAL LABOR WOMENS' CONFERENCE

GENERAL SECRETARY: CYRIL S. WYNNDHAM

FIFTH FLOOR, AINSLIE BUILDING, 39 AINSLIE AVE., CANBERRA, A.C.T.  
 TEL. 4 0393; 4 0394.

AUSTRALIAN LABOR PARTY

FEDERAL SECRETARIAT

times, a changing society and a change of attitude on our part.  
I'm sure, without being unkind, that at least sixty per cent  
of you would have anticipated that Mr. Chaseling's address would  
have concentrated on the virtues of private enterprise banking -  
why you should all bank with the Wales and not with the Commonwealth.  
And we all got a surprise at the tone of his address.  
To be perfectly honest, that kind of speech, with certain  
reservations, we would differ on some things, should have been made  
by a socialist.  
The points that he was making are issues that we raised years  
ago.  
I am not one of these who wants to live in the past or dwell  
on it or exist in it.  
What he was pointing out about the future society, is a future  
to which we pay very little attention. We are so enmeshed in our  
immediate environment and immersed in our immediate problems, that  
we have neglected what our ultimate objective is as a political  
organisation.  
What Brian was saying was not new, and as I listened my mind  
went back to when I was a boy, which was not so very long ago, when  
I came into the Party. I thrived on reading socialist literature,  
including novels. Forty, fifty, sixty years ago, H.G. Wells was  
warning of the very dangers which Brian Chaseling was pointing out  
last night. And can we say that after fifty or sixty years, we  
have heeded those warnings? I remember one of Wells' books,

The Dream - you have probably all read it. Interestingly, this particular edition came originally from the Hamilton Mechanisms Institute and as you know, that's where many people once went to get books to read and so acquire a basic learning. Such institutes have long since gone. In fact we do not have enough public libraries - that's an indication of how far we've progressed - or retrogressed! We have always emphasised the need for an education system which will provide every child with the chance to fulfill a complete scheme of education. But we must constantly ask whether our educational system is equipped for the future.

Now this is what Wells said in The Dream. I'm going to bore you with reading it because it's as pertinent today as it was then. You will recall that the tale is set many years into the future. One of the characters cuts his hand which results in poisoning. He lapses into a coma, during which he has an extensive dream of the past which he/relates to his compatriots.

He relates how he lived in that dream life. Wells was a great socialist thinker as well as a great science fiction writer. The dreamer expresses the deficiencies in the educational system of Great Britain, specifically referring to the teaching of history. He relates,

"I think they were trying to interest the children of the Land in the doings of the Kings and Queens of England, probably as dull a string of monarchs as the world has ever seen. If they rose to interest at times it was through a certain violence; there was one delightful

Henry VIII who had a craving for love and such a tender conscience about the sanctity of marriage that he always murdered one wife before he took another. And there was one Alfred who burnt the cakes, I never knew why. In some ways it embarrassed the Danes, his enemies."

Then he was questioned by one of his friends:

"But was that all the history they taught you?" and he replied: "Queen Elizabeth of England wore a ruff, and James I of Scotland kissed his men favourites."

Then he was asked: "But did they tell you nothing of the beginnings of life and the ends of life, of its endless delights and possibilities?"

What Wells posed forty years ago is precisely what we should be asking ourselves as we look into the future. Are we teaching our children about the ends of life, its delights; its possibilities; its meanings?

When this Conference met two years ago in Sydney we needed 11 seats to form a Government. Today we need double that number - 21. On 1966 results, we will need a 10% swing to give us those seats and this does not matter how the boundaries are drawn. We need a swing of that magnitude on both the old or the new boundaries. Are we equipped to fight that election whenever it may come?

There has been a great deal of discussion in the Party in the last five years on the question of organisation at a national level.

I think it is time we began to look a little more analytically at organization at the lower levels.

I sometimes think we expend a great deal of time, energy and effort and get a very small return for it.

We try to encompass all of the 124 electorates, or 125, in a campaign which lasts only a few weeks.

I am pleased to see that we are moving away from that stupid monstrosity of any political society - whoever started it should be ashamed of himself - the policy speech. Slowly but surely we are moving away from/belief that there must be a policy speech to start a campaign. So for years, ever since Federation, we've had a policy speech in which we expect the Leader to hold forth for an hour, and put everything in and leave nothing out. And if he leaves something out, he's criticised, and if he puts too much in, he's criticised.

At the very same time that he's advancing our policies, those policies are coming under attack from all the other parties.

We are asking an intelligent elector to absorb in three weeks what we want to do for him, at the same time as he's being pressured by the other political parties not to trust us because we cannot do what we've promised. It's an absurd activity.

We must approach electioneering on the basis that the elector is an intelligent being, and not simply one of the flock, and not stupid, or less interested in politics than we are. If we assume that, we must start campaigning well before polling day. In fact we must never stop campaigning.

We should not stop campaigning simply because one election is over: we should start immediately to fight the next.

Should an election come next November, look at the position we are in. Our candidates are only now going into the field - there

will be pre-selections in New South Wales on October 26; Queensland yesterday selected all its candidates; Victoria begins to select

later this month. I'm not now canvassing the merits of candidates. What I'm saying is this. How can you put candidates into the field and expect them to fight a campaign if the election is held on

November 30th?

In the space of three or four weeks we're going to ask men and women to go out and fight an intense campaign. It is an absurdity - absolutely absurd.

Our candidates should be in the field at least six months after one election is held. If we believe - and I have some doubts about

this - that there is a personal following - if you believe this, how can a man build up a personal following in three weeks - it's impossible, it's absurd, it's ridiculous, it's a waste of time, it's

criminal. And the Party must begin to think in terms of selecting its candidates, putting the machinery into operation, as soon as one election is over.

You can use all the arguments in the world against early

selections - that the present method of selecting candidates is cumbersome, it takes a great deal of time, but these are merely excuses, and apologies for inaction.



We must find ways where we can get able candidates - and when I don't mean just those at all - I say able, I don't simply mean people with degrees -/we need the qualified people but we need people who are representative of the entire community - whether they happen to be fortunate enough to have gone through University, whether they're skilled artisans, whether they're trade union officials, and I include both sexes - I'm not discriminating - it's about time we stopped discriminating because we need candidates representing the entire community. And I don't think the Party is dedicating itself enough to these. We need professionals, from all professions - not just lawyers - I have nothing against lawyers - but we need doctors and accountants, as well as the man who works on the factory floor, as well as the man who works in the office, as well as the man who works on the farm. We should be seeking these candidates now - not now - not at this point of time, but we should have been seeking them 18 months ago. You will have seen in this morning's paper some reference to candidates who have been selected in New South Wales. There is one particular candidate who is nominating for Macarthur. The Macarthur electorate has been held for a very long time by a man called Bate who is Chairman of the Liberal Parliamentary Committee on rural affairs - he's an expert, or considered to be an expert, on rural matters. Yet we expect our candidate, who's extremely well qualified for this, a man of great ability, and we expect a man like that to go into an electorate and build up, or not to build up, to create an election organisation with the local people, in three weeks. It's absurd.

In exactly the same way we pour - (what I'm saying about Federal elections applies to State elections) - we pour at least \$200,000 into television and into newspapers in those three weeks and we expect to influence people. There isn't a single business firm that would spend the amount of money that the Labor Party spends - and I've estimated that to be about \$750,000 - that's taking in everything from the national level right down to the smallest branch - no business firm would spend that amount of money in that short space of time - it's absurd, it's ridiculous, it's antiquated. We must begin to think of spending that amount of money, and of raising it, over a much longer period.

I also feel too, that the time has arrived if indeed it has not passed, when we should begin to break down the campaign much more. We have done this to a certain extent in the past. For Queensland, in any national campaign we have always put in two or three things featuring national development. Important; vital to the country as a whole. But put in its crudest political terms, not worth a single vote in Sydney or Melbourne. Similarly, speaking of the problems of the apple and pear growers in Tasmania is not worth a vote in Queensland, not at all. That's not being disparaging to the people who live in Queensland or Sydney. It's a fact of political life, it is plain common sense.

We have commenced in a small way campaigning, we have got to utilise more specialised campaigning, in and among and between electors. We cannot assume that because an elector lives on the south side of Brisbane that his problems are necessarily the same as one who lives on the north shore of Brisbane. Equally so, we

we cannot claim that the person who lives in Geelong is suffering from the same grievances as the person who lives in the Dandenongs. We must begin to think of looking out for the local problems, that could be grafted onto the wider and related national ones. We must assess the problems then spend a lot more time on them in that area.

This is what we did in Corio, and to a certain extent in Dawson. What we did - and what every electorate council can do - we had a breakdown of electors in the first place. We had them analysed out - from Census figures, which can be obtained from the Bureau of Census and Statistics for a very small sum. We had a breakdown of age groups, religions, occupations, places of birth. One thing that came out very clearly in Corio was that the population was of a much older age group than generally in the State. We deduced from that that there were a much larger proportion of pensioners and retired people in Geelong from the facts that were available, and so, naturally, in the Corio campaign there was a greater concentration on this aspect, on coping with problems of the people from 50 upwards, and less on the younger age groups. I'm not saying that that alone necessarily paid electoral dividends.

One doesn't know what causes an elector to change his vote because we have never really attempted to find out.

Australia is still very backward in analysis of voting intentions, we are still very deficient in analysis of voting habits. Though, there is a great deal of material available we

seem reluctant to use it, but we must begin to use what is avail-  
 able so that we can become more effective in campaigning.  
 With specialised campaigning it becomes feasible to break down  
 some of the larger country electorates into more manageable ones.  
 I always find it amusing when people talk about community of  
 interest - so much nonsense. If you have an electorate like  
 Kalgoorlie, the only community of interest between the electors of  
 Wyndham, (incidentally, when the Prime Minister made his first  
 visit to Western Australia, he was told he was going to visit  
 Wyndham and he said "What do I have to go and see him for?" -  
 the only community of interest between a person living at Wyndham  
 and a person living on the southern coast of Western Australia is  
 the fact that they live in a big electorate. That's the only  
 community of interest they have. And in electorates of that kind,  
 the campaign has to be broken down even further. But this places a  
 great responsibility on the party organisation at local, State  
 and Federal levels.  
 We have many thousands of willing workers, volunteers who will  
 year in and year out push this party because they believe in it.  
 They will work for candidates because they believe in them, but  
 we do nothing to train them in the art, if you like, of election-  
 eering. They want to be told, they want to know. We must provide  
 them with the opportunity of gaining an insight into how it should  
 be done, because they want us to win. There is a very simple process  
 of showing them, not only training or schooling, but indicating  
 the avenues which are open, how they can utilise their labours

more effectively and get a greater return for it - and their money - because they put their hands heavily into their pockets. I think it is a responsibility of the Party organisation to concentrate on Party education, as is done in other countries and as was done once - as was done by this Party back in 1900. We taught them then, we trained people, they came together for discussions on Party organisation because they didn't know how to set about it. Then they produced posters and they produced pamphlets in far greater numbers than we do today, because we've become far too complacent and apathetic.

I think if we were to assess, to sit back for perhaps 24 hours and reflect upon what we are doing, what we are not doing and what we should be doing, I think we'd all be better off for it.

The aim of a national campaign, in my view, should be to cope with broad issues and not try to particularise. But, if we've done our job well over the preceding years before an election, then the work that is done on television at a national and state level should be the culmination of the campaign and not its commencement, when everybody sits back and waits with bated breath - or do we - for the policy speech to be delivered, as though it were some holy writ to be brought down from the mountain which is going to get us into office because people are going to accept it immediately.

There is a Party badge which contains the three words - Agitate, Educate, Organise - and while, as I said, we should not live in the past, we should have a look at it sometimes to see just how badly we are doing now.

I think, too, that we've got to become a bit ruthless, as an organisation. As I said, we've got to win 21 seats. You've got to look at electorates to see which ones you can't win at this point, and which ones you can win or must win. One must be quite brutal, and I think people who live, and I have always lived in one, except in the A.C.F., where for the first time in my life/voted for a Labor member of Parliament - but people who live in electorates - such as those on Sydney's North Shore, must view them as hopeless at this stage. Electors will understand if you approach them correctly and say "You want to win as much as the person who is living in the Bartons, the Humes, the Eden-Monaros and this is where we are going to concentrate". And that is where our energies must be devoted.

Of course, we'll make mistakes - after all politicians are human - and in dealing with elections, you are dealing in human beings, and you are not quite sure which way they will react. This doesn't mean that those electorates which are now hopeless should be ignored, because the hopeless electorates of yesterday are the safe Labor seats of today. I believe that in between-times energies should be spent, efforts should be devoted on building up the organisation in those areas and I think it can be done. Sometimes in my position, I feel extremely frustrated because I can't get down and, as it were, put my hands on something, and say this is what I want to do. I have a fortuous route to follow - six states, six razors' edges - I won't go into the factions - but one finds it

the oldest political party", but I shudder every time I hear it  
the oldest political party". I said, "That's quite right, we are  
on the political parties, and I'm going to say the Labor Party is  
in New South Wales. He said, "I'm going to put in a little paragraph  
morning, - Kath Walker in Queensland and Bill Morrison and Bob Whan

Bureau regarding the candidates who have been announced this  
I had a phone call this morning from the News and Information  
crusades, but we have become too much a part of the establishment.  
There are just as many issues that need exposing, that need  
have and did become.

the commencement of the Peace Talks in Paris, how much quieter we  
think we would be rendered almost speechless, and we saw this with  
completely. I'm not saying that Vietnam is not important, but I

about if the Vietnam conflict ceased tomorrow, if it ceased  
not just an institution. I sometimes wonder what we would talk  
as a reforming Party, we must again become a crusading Party, and  
I think that what is desperately required of us today as a radical,  
of organisation another, the question of policy yet another. But  
However, the question of candidates is one thing, the question

little too self-satisfied and smug.  
divorced from reality, it's a very artificial city - we become a  
realities of the situation. Here in Canberra, we tend to be  
because there you're confronted with the problems and you see the  
aligning, at the local level. It's good for all of us to get down  
frustrating, because the thing that I miss most is election camp-

because we are the oldest party but we should be young in ideas and  
 we should never be afraid to mention words which people think are  
 blasé. When you pick up a newspaper these days, there's this  
 continued emphasis on sex and sadism, and hardly anybody talks  
 about love and affection. We seem to shy away from it - afraid of  
 not being 'with it'. I heard, travelling in the car yesterday, one  
 of these English pop singers, Cilla Black - if English, I'm  
 ashamed of her - and she was introduced as having been given  
 Mexican mushrooms to "turn her on". She was interviewed and she  
 said, "Yes! Well, this does go on - of course it goes on - of  
 course there will always be this side of life, but why should we  
 assume everybody likes it and wants it and needs it? I don't think  
 they do. We are just deluding ourselves if we think this is all  
 they're interested in."

There was an analysis made two years ago of the readership of  
 newspapers: it was a very small one, but it was an indication.  
 People were asked, "What do they read first?" You ask a person  
 who lives in Sydney or Melbourne - everyone in Melbourne  
 goes mad on Australian Rules - and nobody goes mad on soccer. But  
 it will be assumed that everybody in Sydney or Melbourne reads the  
 sporting pages first. But the survey clearly illustrated that the  
 highest percentage of readers - this was through all the age ranges -  
 read politics, international news, Australian news, and sport was  
 running 5 or 6. The assumption - and we as a Party live on myths  
 and assumptions - you ask some people, "My area - it's this, it's  
 that" - no proof, no evidence, no attempt to find it out, just an



assumption - that because you live in a rural electorate, you are a farmer, and you may find out that a small number are farmers but others are in different industries altogether. Of course, there will always be myths, but we as the Party of change, we as the Party that's striving to create - our objective is a good wholesome life, or any term you like to use - we who are struggling and have struggled in the past - to make life, if you like, beautiful and satisfying - should not be content with the sordid, the mediocre, the deprived other side of life.

We must be prepared to live dangerously in the future, to be as audacious, as we were in the past; not to run from problems because we think they're too difficult or because they cost too much money, or because they may take a long time to introduce. We should grasp them, and say "We want them for as a Party, we think they are right for society, we think they are right for the individual." And if we believe this, we should then fight for them and go out and argue for them and seek our way into the future.

This is the only way we emphasise the differences between ourselves and the Liberal Party. And there are fundamental differences between the two Parties as there were in days gone by.

We are concerned for humanity and for the individual and this is what we should have always in the forefront of our thinking. And when we speak in terms of education, when we speak in terms of health, when we speak in terms of social services, remember that these are only single threads of the web we are trying to weave.

And we speak in terms of equal opportunity for all. Is that child  
But we give them government permission - they are permitted to leave.  
no good? ("He could be the most brilliant") Of course he could!  
probably wouldn't be any good anyway. Who said he's going to be  
keep them there. And I'm not accepting the fact that the child  
before the compulsory age because their families are too poor to  
are still permitted, in this day and age, in 1968, to leave school  
We are the ones who should be exposing the fact that children  
We are the ones who should be exposing these injustices.

media.

You are doing it in a small way, but we are relying on the mass  
are the worst exploited. Who is exposing consumer exploitation?  
it in Canberra - we are not the pampered darlings of Australia, we  
prepared to say we are going to do something about it. We could do  
Well, when is anyone going to do anything about it, unless we are  
"We can't do anything about it unless all States act in harmony."  
Commonwealth, they pass the buck to the States, and the States say,  
that's being exploited and whenever you expect action from the  
man was being exploited for his labour: today its his wage packet  
consumer protection, consumer exploitation. Sixty years ago the  
There's one thing that affects each and everyone of you as a woman -  
There are many things we could demonstrate about if we wanted to.  
There are so many things we could crusade about if we wanted to.  
it has been submerged, we begin to die.  
If we ever lose our crusading spirit, and to a certain extent

getting an equal opportunity with some other more fortunate one?  
We spend a great deal of time fighting ourselves. We spend a  
great deal of time tearing into each other. We spend a great deal  
of time ripping ourselves apart instead of really looking at the  
enemies we should be fighting, that we should be exposing.  
Sometimes I hunger for the old days, while I wouldn't want to  
live in them. I've often heard it said that it was much easier to  
be a socialist - and how often do we hear that word used? How often  
do we use it ourselves? I think we're afraid of it sometimes - it  
has been said that it was easier to be a socialist in the early days  
than it is now. That's probably true, because the industrial revol-  
ution created the great gulf between abundant luxury and grinding  
poverty. But our task is to ensure that the technological revolution  
does not also create a great gulf between the better educated, the  
skilled technocrat and the rest of us. The age of the technocrat  
must never become the age of the autocrat, because if it does, then  
we as a Party have failed.  
I have gone on too long, Madam President. I wish your delib-  
erations well. I am sure that you will return to your home states  
revitalised.  
I have an apology to make on the one hand. That is my famous  
report - or infamous report - which is generally called Wyncham  
Report - the poor fellow in New South Wales, whom I've never met -  
must have as much trouble as I do - I referred to you as an insipid  
organisation - and you still are. It's not that the men won't let

you be anything else. You are capable women in your own right. Look at you round this table. Listen to your discussions. I've been sitting out here. And is there a woman that can't match a man? Is there one? Vi Jordan can win a pre-selection ballot. Kath Anderson can go into a completely man's world. The first time she went in I can imagine all the engineers and these skilled men who leave me for dead, would think, "We can give her the run-around". You can do it. I know it's difficult. I know it's hard for you. You can do it. I know it's difficult. I know it's hard for you. I know it's difficult to get you up in pre-selections, but one of the reasons is you will not agree amongst yourselves. Sometimes the men pick a woman, because we thing you want her, and then you don't want her. You tell us we've done the wrong thing. You reject yourselves. You write yourselves down. Now you do a great deal for the Party. I think you can do much more if you use the opportunities that are available to you. The one recommendation that was approved by Federal Conference makes your Executive a Standing Committee. Now that means that the entire expense of that Executive is borne by Federal funds. This is something which would enable you to do something the British Labour women did. To initiate discussions of your own, seek out things that you want to know. Prepare reports on women's conditions which you want to get up to the Party. Establish yourselves as you have done here in your individual capacities. I would like to see this Conference, not of 12 women, not of 100 women, but representative of every women's branch in Australia. I have suggested that

-----

Thank you very much.

in other places, and that these will ultimately become policy.  
use, to present reports along the lines you have been discussing  
of you before then. But the new arrangements are there for you to  
in two years' time - I don't know where - I trust I shall see all  
I conclude by wishing you all well and hoping to see you again  
that is an excuse.

I'll say to you as I have said in the past, that is not a reason,  
If you ever use, Carol, the excuse that men won't let you,

yourselves within the Party.

problems you are faced with - pre-selections and establishing  
if you utilise your efforts. I know that this doesn't overcome the  
an exhaustive survey. I think something like that could be done,  
Women which was prepared by the British Labour Party's women after  
This is the report I was referring to, Discrimination Against  
more, much more dedicated than the men ever are on these matters.  
send a delegate to somewhere or other, we'll raise the money. Much  
a task to do does not say, "Well, we're going to do this. We'll  
women's organisation, however small the women's branch, that given  
too much money". Everything costs money. I have yet to know a  
elsewhere before, and it's been said, "You can't do it, it costs