1. **Name of item P2915 should be ‘Town of Guildford’**

Guildford today is a living community and living place, it is not a historic relic frozen in time. The proposed name of Guildford Historic Town suggests otherwise. The qualifier ‘historic’ is both superfluous and misleading, suggesting the current place is a museum artefact. A ‘historic town’ may be considered as a class of category of heritage item in some statutory or community heritage systems, but that is not the same as a proper toponym or place name.

The Guildford Town Trust was established in 1843, the second town trust established after Perth, and from then on at least the name Town of Guildford conveyed a sense of the importance of the town.¹ In 1871 the Town Trust was replaced by a municipal council with style of the ‘The Council and Burgesses of the Town of Guildford’, and the first elections were held on 2 March 1871 for councillors.² This was the second municipal election, after Fremantle, held under the new *Municipal Institutions Act 1871*. The municipal council of the Town of Guildford survived until 1961.

Today, the name Town of Guildford survives in real place names such as Guildford Town Wharf, Guildford Town Hall & Library (heritage place P02460), and in business names such as Guildford Town Garden Centre. The name Town of Guildford better reflects the historical development and continuing vitality and character of the town than the proposed Guildford Historic Town name. Documentation form, field No 2, should be changed to reflect this.

**Comment No 1**

*The name of item P2915, if registered, should be ‘Town of Guildford’*

2. **Curtilage boundaries need to include adjacent river reaches**

The significance of Guildford partly rests of its role as a river port (Statement of Significance para 2, assessment of Historical Significance 11.2 para 3, and Documentary Evidence 13.1 paras 11, 13). Guildford was Western Australia’s only inland river port, and this needs to be cited in the rarity assessment of significance (12.1). The significance of this role is evident in the seal and emblem of Guildford, an anchor from which are appended a wheat garb and a bunch of grapes. The proposed boundaries of the listed or registered area should be prolonged, from those depicted on the proposed curtilage plan, to be described in text and shown on plan as the northern and western banks of the Swan River and southern and southeastern banks of the Helena River, in order to understand and conserve this historic significance.

I understand from historic plans that the historic town boundaries did not include the river courses, but if the waterways are not included within the listed curtilage, this aspect of Guildford’s significance is underplayed in the registration and will not be considered in any

---

¹ *Government Gazette*, 27 January 1843
² *Government Gazette*, 21 February 1871
future development proposals that may impact on these reaches of both rivers, which in turn may obscure or destroy the historic riverine element in Guildford’s significance, including any underwater or riverbank archaeological resources associated with historic river port functions.

Comment No 2.1
The boundaries of item P2915, if registered, should be prolonged to follow the northern and western banks of the Swan River and southern and south eastern banks of the Helena River, immediately adjacent to the town

Comment No 2.2
An additional assessment under the rarity criterion (12.1) should reference the rarity of Guildford as the first and only example in Western Australia of an inland river port.

3. Kings Meadows and Guildford Common need to referenced in assessments
The Kings Meadows north, west, south and east sections, are marked as ‘For the use of the Town under such Regulations as may from Time to Time be established’, on the Sutherland Survey of Guildford, undated by c1829.³ By 1842 the northern Kings Meadow, adjoining the Swan River, was defined as commonage in a pencil notation on the plan of Guildford.⁴ A later, and undated plan, of Guildford shows Reserve 256A as Commonage, Reserve 261A on the Helena River as Commonage, Reserve 253A at the confluence of the Swan and Helena rivers as Kings Meadow and Reserve 254A as Town Meadow.⁵ Reserve 261A is now called Kings Meadow.

This apparently somewhat inconsistent use of the terms Kings Meadow and Commonage since 1829 point to a very significant element in Guildford’s history that is unrecognised in the documentation. A meadow is land for growing and making hay, especially in a riverside location.⁶ The ‘Kings’ element in the name indicates that these meadows are set aside to remain in the King’s (or Crown) ownership for producing hay for government or military stock. The land was not to be sold for private use. The colonial authorities, however, soon began to sell meadow hay to pay salaries, and hay was easily available from private farmers, so that their original purpose became redundant.⁷ The Guildford townsfolk gradually began to adapt the meadow lands as common lands for grazing town stock, such as household milking cows, and assumed a right of commonage to do so long before any were officially gazetted as commons.⁸

³ SROWA plan, AU WA S235-cons3868 171, undated but c1829: see Michael Bourke, On The Swan, UWAP Press, Nedlands 1987: 43
⁴ SROWA plan, 1842 AU WA S235-cons3868 172, dated 1842
⁵ SROWA plan, AU WA S235-cons3868 176, undated
⁶ For examples of this usage in Guildford, see ‘To be sold by public auction … well known Estate Spring Park’, Perth Gazette, 6 September 1834; ‘Correspondence [RG Meares, The Bower, Guildford]’, Perth Gazette, 20 January 1838: 11; ‘Annual Report of the Agricultural Society, Perth Gazette, 8 December 1838
⁷ Letter from Dr Giustiniani, Swan River Guardian, 9 November 1837; ‘United Services Tavern’ [advt], Perth Gazette, 5 September 1835; Stirling’s statistical report in 1837 estimated some 360 acres [145.6 ha] of ‘artificial hay’ were now being grown by colonists in the colony: Perth Gazette, 16 June 1838; the Agricultural Society estimated that between 1834 and 1838 between 200 and 240 tons of ‘natural hay’ was cut each year: ‘Present State and Condition of the Colony’, Perth Gazette, 13 October 1838
⁸ It can be noted here that, although the term ‘commonage’ is often applied to places, the word actually refers to the rights people could exercise on common land. Gazettals referred to ‘commonage’ as the purpose of a
By the 1870s, rights of commonage were a source of political division. In the 1871 Legislative Council elections, Mr Brockman at Guildford proposed that commonage rights should extend to Crown Land around blocks in townsites including Guildford; while Mr Monger at York opposed commons altogether as a “fertile source of disputes among neighbours”. Nevertheless, commonage rights were recognised in the new 1872 Land Regulations, and Governor Weld advised London of his approval for regulations that allowed for deferred payment for land in areas adjacent to commons in order to concentrate the population. Brockman lost the election, but his view prevailed in Guildford when, in 1877, all of the Kings Meadows were gazetted for the purpose of commonage and vested in the municipal council “in trust for the benefit of the inhabitants of the township of Guildford”, and tenders were called for erecting paling fences around each of the new commons. Monger’s concern, however, was evident in Guildford in 1886 when there were complaints the municipal council was favouring access to the commons by some (“the tenants of JPs”) and excluding others. In the same year, and perhaps in response to increasing demand, the common by the Helena River (Reserve 261A) was extended in area.

The Guildford commons and meadows illustrate the adaptation of south-eastern English communal land holdings and usages in colonial Western Australia to an urban setting. This is an under-researched but growing area of historical study, with most research to date focused on rural commons. The Fremantle Common seems to have been the most contentious of the urban commons, but Guildford also has significant research potential in understanding that urban history. Given that no commons are as yet registered in the State Register of Heritage Places, this importance should be recognised in the documentation and statement of significance.

Comment No 3
An additional assessment in the Statement of Significance, and another under the historic criterion (11.2) and the rarity criterion (12.1) should reference the historical values and research potential of the Town of Guildford for understanding the development of communal forms of land tenure and self-governance through its King’s Meadows and common lands, especially in an urban context.

4. The periodisations need some refinement

reserve, and properly the reserved land is a ‘common’. However, in vernacular use the word commonage has been used in Western Australia to refer to both the rights or practices as well as the places.

9 ‘Political Meeting at Guildford’, The Inquirer, 14 September 1870: 3; Public Meeting at York’, Perth Gazette, 7 April 1871: 3
10 ‘Government Despatches’, The Herald, 16 March 1872: 1
11 Government Gazette, 29 May 1877; Michael Bourke, On The Swan, UWAP Nedlands 1987: 231
12 ‘Letters to the Editor | Guildford Grievances | Eliza Tracey’, The Inquirer, 24 November 1886: 5
13 Government Gazette, 23 September 1886
There is an inconsistent and somewhat confusing use of periodisation in the documentation. The value of the periodisations would be enhanced for significance and management purposes if they are consistent throughout the document and assessments.

The Statement of Significance (10, para 1) defines five periods: foundation of the colony, convict era, gold boom, federation and inter-war. This is repeated in Historic Value (11.2, para 2, criterion 2.2). The Documentary Evidence (13.1) is arranged in five periods: Colonial Era 1829-1949, Convict Era 1850-1881, Gold Boom era, Inter-war Period, Post-WWII, some with chronological dating and some without. The Physical Evidence (13.2) identifies one specific period, Post-1950s Housing and Construction (page 40). The Archaeological Assessment (page 41) identifies ‘three key periods’ of Colonial 1829-1850, Convict 1850-1876, and post-Convict which includes 1880-1898. The Comparative Information (13.3) identifies a single period of 1829-1890 (page 42) and within that a period of comparable town formation of 1826-c1832, while the Archaeological Comparative (pages 44-45) identifies the three periods referenced on page 41, with an additional period of Post-1880s and Gold Boom.

While there may be reasonable arguments for this approach, it is an approach that may also be confusing or misleading for researchers, planners and assessors using the documentation in the future to assess development proposals, among other uses. It would be preferable to adopt a consistent periodisation throughout the documentation. From my reading and understanding, a consistently applied periodisation something like this would be useful:

- From time immemorial: Mandoon, a Noongar domain
- 1827-1850: Frontier river port
- 1851-1881: Convict village to self-governing community
- 1882-1904: Town at the crossroads
- 1905-1961: Westralian country town
- 1962-2018: Old town, cherished and contested

Whatever periodisation is adopted, the periods needs to be clearly named and dated, and applied consistently throughout the documentation.

Value would also be added to the itemisation of each street in the Physical Evidence, pages 23-40, by assigning to each street the period or periods best expressed in its extant built and environmental fabric.

---

Comment No 4.1
A clearly identified and coherent periodisation, based upon Guildford’s historical evolution in its Western Australian context, should be developed and applied consistently throughout the documentation

Comment 4.2
The period or periods best expressed by the existing built and landscape fabric of each street could be identified in the Physical Evidence section

5. The use of the historic themes in the documentation is not clear
Section 11 of the documentation (page 4) lists the Australian and Western Australian historic themes “used to determine the cultural heritage significance of the place”. They are never referenced again in the documentation.
The use of the themes is unclear, at best, to me. I can envisage a number of ways they could be usefully deployed, such as in the comparative analysis or as database search terms or by being related to the periods, but as presented in the documentation they play no obvious role in determining the cultural significance of Guildford, as claimed, or in structuring and giving coherence to the documentary, physical or archaeological evidence.

Comment No 5

*Clearly identified and coherent historic themes, based upon Guildford’s historical evolution in its Western Australian context, should be developed and applied consistently throughout the documentation.*

6. The historic associations with Guildford need to be more encompassing

The associations with historic figures identified in the documentation are all wealthy professional or business men from the mid-late colonial period. No women, no Aboriginal people, no non-British people and no 20th century figures are included, although the historical significance of Guildford encompasses all of these people. This is a weakness in the documentation. The following persons and groups could be considered for inclusion in the documentation (section 13.1 Documentary Evidence):

- Miss Helena Elizabeth King (1892-1964), landscape horticulturalist and Guildford Municipal Councillor 1944-1947, of 61 Helena Street Guildford. Miss King, along with Dr Merab Harris, was elected to the council in 1944, not only the first women elected to Guildford Municipal Council but also making Guildford the first local government in Western Australia to have two women elected to council at the same time. Miss King studied arts in London and horticulture at Kew Gardens and in Melbourne, and played an important role in the mid-twentieth century municipal tree planting and town beautification programs undertaken during and after her tenure, and later became a garden designer. Her election program included making Guildford a garden city modelled on Welwyn in England, an increasing use of Western Australian native plants including the Goldfields coral gum, Burdett’s Mallee and lemon-scented gums, and experimented with growing grass trees in gardens. Miss King was also secretary to the Lady Gowrie Child Centre in Victoria Park, and a founder of the Meerilinga Kindergarten Union Training Centre. Miss King’s term end in 1947, after which she and Merab Harris became critics of the municipal council’s willingness to allow industrial uses in East Guildford, its planting of Queensland box trees as street trees and the removal of sugar gums in James Street. From 1953 onwards she ran a garden section in the ‘Women’s Magazine’ program on ABC Radio. She is currently being considered for a biographical entry in

---

15 ‘Two Women Join Guildford Council | Lecturer and Horticulturalist’, *Swan Express*, 16 November 1944: 1; see also Judy Skene, *Engendering Local Authority: Women municipal councillors in Western Australia 1920-1999*, PhD Thesis, History Department, University of Western Australia 2000
16 An example of her advertisements as a garden designer and consultant, see *Western Mail*, 12 April 1945: 2
17 ‘Landscape Gardener’, *Western Mail*, 23 November 1944: 31; ‘Native Trees and Shrubs in Garden Design’, *Western Mail*, 1 February 1945: 31
18 ‘They Planted a Tree’, *Daily News* 9 June 1945: 28
19 ‘Guildford Industrial Area | protests against expansion’, *Swan Express*, 6 December 1951: 3; ‘Guildford Gums are Eulogised by Petitioners’, *West Australian*, 16 October 1953: 4
the Australian Dictionary of Biography, and more research is underway. Helena King’s house at 61 Helena Street still stands.

- Dr Merab Harris, née Taubman (1901-1985), the other woman elected at the same time as Miss King, of 53 Helena Street Guildford, was a lecturer in Economic History at UWA, previously a Hackett Scholar at the London School of Economics and then at the Geneva School of International Studies. She was awarded her PhD at London University with a thesis on the emigration of people and money to Western Australia. Dr Harris had been a tutor of corresponding students at UWA in the 1920s, and on her return to Perth she became a full-time lecturer in history at the university under Professor EOG Shann and later Professor Fred Alexander. Merab Harris married Dr Leon Taubman of St George’s College Crawley just before her election, and served as Councillor Merab Taubman while retaining her maiden name as her professional name at the university. She ran on a platform of establishing a kindergarten and pre-school centre in Guildford, as well as a municipal library, and maintaining Guildford’s identity as a ‘secluded and separate district’, and along with Miss King believed that having two women and their ‘progressive methods’ on council would benefit the district. In 1945 Dr Harris and Miss King were nominated in the press as two women of whom Western Australians could be proud because of their municipal service. Merab Taubman Harris was an assured scholar of Western Australian history, and in a 1953 review of a play on the life of CY O’Connor, she dismissed the work by Vernon Lyall as “historically absolutely groundless ... a drama designed as an instrument of personal propaganda.” Merab Taubman Harris’ home at 53 Helena Street still stands.

- Lady Ellen Stirling, née Mangles (1807-1874), Western Australia’s first vicereine, first consort of a Western Australian knight (after 1833), and first chatelaine of ‘Woodbridge’, the Stirling country estate on Guildford town’s eastern boundary that was modelled on the spatial relationships between a south-eastern England manorial estate and village. Ellen Stirling has been somewhat overshadowed, historiographically, by her husband’s achievements but is a significant historical figure in her own right with intimate connections to Guildford. Historian Frank Crowley acknowledged this to some degree when he wrote “The governor expected his guests to dress formally for dinner, even if meals were taken under canvas in oppressive summer heat, or at his country seat of Woodbridge, near the little town of Guildford. The musical evenings and the outdoor recreations of hunting and picnicking were designed to make any new settler from the English counties feel almost at home.” He wrote of “the dignified bearing of his youthful and charming wife, whose gracious manner amidst her recurrent pregnancies, endeared her to wives in the settlement”, but who by 1838 “was also eager to go home, being tired of the restricted social round and apprehensive about the education of her elder

---

20 ‘Two Women Join Guildford Council | Lecturer and Horticulturalist’, Swan Express, 16 November 1944: 1;
22 ‘Engagements’, West Australian, 12 April 1944: 7
23 ‘Social Services’, Western Mail, 23 November 1944: 31
24 ‘Western Australian is Proud of These Women’, Daily News, 8 January 1945: 5
25 ‘The Life Line’, West Australian, 16 May 1953: 9
children.”

26 This picture is humanised a little more by historian Pamela Statham-Drew. Ellen Stirling missed the ceremonial foundation of Perth in 1829 because she was pregnant, but received as a memento a wooden sewing box made from the fallen jarrah (now in the WA Museum collections). While at Woodbridge, Ellen could watch her young children playing in the river shallows and flats. She was unhappy with the conditions in Government House Perth and preferred Woodbridge. The colonial press provides some insight into Ellen’s character and significance in her own right, and the ceremonial and emotional roles she successfully played as vicereine. Lady Stirling laid the foundation stone for the second “extremely chaste, as well as appropriate to the situation” Government House on 20 October 1834 in Perth. In the late summer of 1835 Lady Stirling accompanied her husband to a ‘native corrobora’ behind the barrack grounds in Perth to cultivate political relationships with the ‘our allies the Swan tribe’. A few months later Lady Stirling was attending the Anniversary Day celebrations with her husband. In November 1835 Lady Stirling was nominated as the recipient of funds paid in a libel case, to be used “for the benefit of the poor”. In this one year, which is representative of other years, Lady Stirling fulfils the ceremonial roles expected of a vicereine: symbolically marking the founding of new institutions, celebrating the continuity of the colony, supporting political strategizing, and distributing alms to the needy. The history of vicereines has received little attention in Australian historiography, but as this short list attests, it is not a history of insignificance, especially in terms of performing and maintaining the institutions of state. This was reciprocated and validated by the colonists. In 1836, at the launch of the first vessel built in the colony of local timber, launched by Mrs Roe and named in Lady Stirling’s presence and in her honour, a poet captured something of that spirit: “We launch our first-built ship today ... / And waiting for glad sea breeze / And christened with blood-red wine / And named by woman’s voice divine / the “Lady Stirling” proudly rides / Queen of Australia’s ocean tides / On, little bark, and be thy name / The watchword of our future fame/ ..” Lady Stirling also played her role as chatelaine of Woodbridge, such as attending the Guildford races in October 1836 (entering a hack named Dance). Her role as mother was chronicled by births and deaths, intimate experiences she shared with many of colonial women. The political significance of the vicereine is indicated by an episode spread over 14 months when Lady Stirling was implicated by the Swan River Guardian in a land scandal. The Guardian


27 Pamela Statham-Drew, James Stirling and the Birth of the Swan River Colony, Pandorus, Subiaco 2004

28 Western Australian Journal, 25 October 1834

29 ‘Native Corrobora and Fight’, Perth Gazette, 28 March 1835

30 ‘Frolics & Festivities’, Perth Gazette, 6 June 1835

31 ‘Civil Court | Case of Libel’, Perth Gazette, 14 November 1835

32 This is currently being remedied to some degree with the publication by Carol Liston and Christine Wright (eds), NSW Governors Wives and Companions since 1788, planned for early 2019.


34 Perth Gazette, 17 September 1836 and 8 October 1836;

preceded the scandal with this satirical editorial: “our humble meed of praise to the general acclamation which hails Lady Stirling. As a wife, a mother, or a friend of the poor, her conduct has been a shining example to all classes; and we can assure her Ladyship that we do not believe she has one single enemy in the Colony; and for this plain reason that independent of these considerations, she has always shewn herself to be an enemy to Humbug of any kind. We do hope that many happy years are in store for her, and have only farther to state that wherever her Ladyship goes, she will always command the respect and good wishes of the Colonists of Swan River”.  

Shortly afterwards, it carried an anonymous story ‘derived from good authority’ that Lady Stirling, Mrs Roe and Mrs Brown had each received large land grants, and rhetorically asked “for what reason? The husbands of these Ladies have pretty large slices of Land...”. A few months later it repeated the claims in more detail, concluding “The watch word of Nelson at the battle of Trafalgar was "England expects that every man will do his duty." and as the Ladies of Swan River have done their duty like true Settlers in the Colony, we trust that Sir James Stirling will not be backward in extending his favors [sic] to all.” Finally, a few months later, the Guardian admitted “I have committed one mistake, and in justice to the amiable Lady whose name was mentioned, I have the greatest pleasure in rectifying it. I understand that Lady Stirling never obtained a grant of Land of 2000 acres in Fee Simple. It ought to have been Mrs Currie, wife of Captain Currie R. N. the former Harbour Master who has left the Colony long ago, with no intention of ever returning. The three were Mrs Currie, Mrs Brown, and Mrs Roe. (To be continued)”. Land, and access to it, was a sensitive issue in the colony, and linking Lady Stirling with an anonymously-sourced land scandal indicates the vulnerability of a vicereine who cannot publicly reply, but whose name and reputation can be besmirched by her husband’s foes for their political advantage. Lady Stirling is a significant figure in Western Australian history, and in the history of Guildford. Her associations with Guildford can still be read in the topography of Woodbridge.

- Rev Dr Louis Giustiniani (xx-18xx) was Anglican missionary and minister at Guildford 1835-1838. His term was contentious for several reasons, including his public criticisms of the settlers’ ‘barbarous customs’ of shooting and mutilating Aboriginal people, allegations about the conduct of Captain Irwin, head of the military garrison, and his alignment with the Swan River Guardian ‘radicals’. There are several publications, including Lesley Borowitza, The Reverend Dr Louis Giustiniani and Anglican Conflict in the Swan River Colony 1836-1838, Murdoch University 2008, a journal article by Bruce Devenish ‘A Most Malignant Man’, Early Days: Journal of the RWAHS, Vol 13, No 2, 2008, and book chapters such as Michael Bourke, On The Swan, Chapter 5 ‘A Turbulent Priest’, UWAP Nedlands 1987 that outline in some detail Giustiniani’s career and significance in Western Australian and Guildford history. The Mission Church he built on land Stirling donated from his Woodbridge Estate no longer stands, but was in the vicinity of the Chapel of St Mary & St George at Guildford Grammar School, and I understand in situ archaeological evidence is highly likely to survive.

---

36 Swan River Guardian, 3 November 1836: 18  
37 Swan River Guardian, 23 March 1837  
38 Swan River Guardian, 30 November 1837  
39 Swan River Guardian, 11 January 1838
John Scaddan (1876-1934), Labor MLA and first Labor Premier of Western Australia 1911-1916, lived in Guildford for several years although representing a seat in the Goldfields. He built a new brick cottage at 38 East Street, Guildford in 1908. The house was named ‘Ivanhoe’ after his Goldfields seat. He was a player and strong supporter of Guildford Bowling Club in 1911. Sometime after winning the premiership and government in 1911, Scaddan had a larger new home built in Mt Lawley, also named ‘Ivanhoe’, to which the family moved in 1912 or 1913. During the period of his Guildford residency, some of the Scaddan Labor government’s most significant legislation was made, such as the Workers Homes Act, and the arbitration and workers compensation schemes were substantially expanded. Scaddan’s ‘state socialism’ policy also began to be put into effect, including the State Brickworks and State Abattoirs, and in 1912 he introduced a state income tax. After leaving Guildford, Scaddan maintained strong links to Guildford and Midland, and in 1917 after the Labor Party split over conscription he took the side of Billy Hughes and joined his Nationalist Party. In April 1917, mid-way between the two conscription referenda, he faced a rancorous public meeting in West Guildford to explain his decisions.

There are numerous published accounts of Scaddan’s government and politics, including an Australian Dictionary of Biography entry, all of which clearly attest his significance at the State level, while an understanding of the chronological sequence of his important legislative and political achievements clearly connect many of them with the period of his residence in Guildford. Scaddan’s house, ‘Ivanhoe’, at No 38 East Street, still stands.

Comment
An additional assessment in the Statement of Significance, and another under the historic criterion (11.2), should reference the significant historical associations of Guildford and the significant persons of Miss Helena King, Dr Merab Harris, Lady Ellen Stirling, Rev Dr Louis Giustiniani and John Scaddan.

7. Guildford’s significance as a self-governing community could be given attention
In addition to material and references in points 1, 3 and 6 above, the documentation (section 13.1 Documentary Evidence) would be enhanced by identifying and referencing Guildford’s significance as a self-governing community with a strong sense of local identity. The history of local self-governance through the Town Trust and then Municipal Council, and through local management of the Guildford meadows and commons, has been outlined earlier, as has the aspirations to conserve Guildford’s local identity by Miss Helena King and Dr Merab Harris.

The significance of Guildford as a river port has been referred to, from which was derived the Town’s distinctive emblem of an anchor from which a wheat garb or sheaf and a bunch of grapes are appended, clearly evidenced by the use of the emblem on and in the Guildford
Town Hall and Municipal Office and elsewhere throughout the Town. I believe this device dates back to the Seal used by the Municipal Council and possibly the Town Trust, but this detail needs further research.

One further piece of documentary evidence that supports the significance of this local identity is the strength of the secession campaign and referendum in Guildford during the 1930s. The Guildford Branch of the Dominion League (the secessionist political organisation) was formed 1931, under the aegis of the Guildford Municipal Council. The branch president was the Mayor of Guildford Mr R Galder-Crowther, and its secretary was Mr VJ Minchin. It seems to have been the second-most active urban branch after the Nedlands Branch. The League and its Guildford Branch were actively opposed by the Labor State MLA for Guildford-Midland Mr WD Johnson, who was a leading anti-secessionist. The secession referendum, held on 8 April 1933, produced the following results in the seat of Guildford-Midland: Yes 3,488 (62.7%), No 2,072. This compares to a metropolitan-wide Yes vote of 64.8%, and a State-wide Yes vote of 65.9%. Because the seat encompassed both strongly secessionist Guildford and more equivocal Midland, the overall result obscures the Guildford-specific vote to some extent. However, as with all the other towns and districts that produced strong Yes votes for secessions, there are strong associations and connections between the local and ‘Westralian’ identities of those communities.

Comment

An additional assessment in the Statement of Significance, and another under the historic criterion (11.2), should reference the significance of the continuing strength of the sense of place and local identity among Guildfordians, evident in the ongoing use of the Guildford seal or emblem, a long and continuous history of communal and self-government, the history of defending the local cultural and built environment, and ongoing associations with movements to maintain expressions of local and Western Australian cultural identities.

8. Additional points that could be addressed in the documentation:
   a. The role of religion in Guildford’s history needs better recognition
   b. The role of hotels as distinct commercial enterprise and built form in Guildford need better recognition, and
   c. The significance of Guildford’s ‘green belt’ could be better articulated

---

43 ‘News in a Nutshell’, Western Mail, 30 July 1931: 22; ‘Secession | Branch formed at Guildford’, West Australian, 28 July 1931: 10