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Abstract

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND COMMUNITY:
STOUFFVILLE, ONTARIO, 1888-1971

by

Cathy Elaine Morgason Robertson

An examination of the relationship between recreational facilities and community in Stouffville, was the focus of this research. For this study, community manifests itself as community spirit and boosterism. Information about this association was gathered from the local weekly newspaper, the Stouffville Tribune. Although the nature of the data collected was limited, a nearly complete account of Stouffville's recreational facilities, including information about development, maintenance and operation was acquired. Investigation into the presence of community was conducted.

The relationship which existed between recreational facilities and community was dynamic and complex. Sometimes a relationship existed, while at other times it was absent. Before 1950, it was a relationship which was stable, while after 1950 the nature of the relationship had changed. This change resulted from larger changes which occurred in society. The closeness of Toronto, the automobile and television were all influences upon the relationship. The businessmen of the village and the provincial government also influenced the relationship.

The dynamics of the relationship were also shown by its unobtrus-
ive nature. For the most part, both recreational facilities and community were shadowed by everyday affairs of the village. There were four conditions which made this relationship noticeable in village life: when the quality of the facility was seen as being unacceptable; when citizen ownership was evident; when identification and price in Stouffville was possible; and when the quality of the facility was very good and Stouffvillians wanted to defend the status of their village. These conditions however did not explain all occurrences of community in the history of the facilities. With these exceptions, community appeared as a guiding philosophy in the villager's lives, as well as being part of their lives. Community was an important component in the lives of Stouffvillians and in the history of their recreational facilities.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

An understanding of modern organized recreation, including a comprehension of who participated and why, can be gleaned by studying the facilities used. As Jobling states, one of the elements fostering modern organized sport is the availability of facilities.¹ Thus, in recording the history of these structures and areas, it is possible to explore not only what happened, but also why it happened.

This study focuses on the development, maintenance and operation of recreational facilities, examining why these facilities existed in Stouffville, Ontario, Canada. The explanatory approach to be used in this endeavour is the concept of community. Thus the central purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between recreational facilities and community in Stouffville, from 1888 to 1971.

To conduct this examination, a three step investigation has been chosen. First, the existence of recreational structures and areas in and near Stouffville is documented. Secondly, the presence of community in enhancing or impeding development, maintenance and/or operation of the facilities is examined. Lastly, in order to understand the relationship between recreational facilities and community, the concept of community, with respect to all facilities, is investigated.²
Definitions

There are three concepts central to this investigation; community, recreation and facilities.

Community is defined as an identification by local residents to the locality. This identification manifests itself as community spirit and/or boosterism. Community spirit can be further defined as a sense of responsibility, commitment and/or identification by residents to a locality. It functions through a process of people working together to achieve common goals. This process is characterized by the residents' belief that these common goals serve their needs and better and/or internally promote the locality. Boosterism refers to externally directed efforts to promote notable or quality features of the locality. These efforts are characterized by the residents' belief that these activities increase the status of the locality, including both its growth and perceived quality of recreation.

Both community spirit and boosterism deal with citizen identification with the locality. The key difference between them is that community spirit sponsors an internal aspect to promotion, while boosterism involves externally directed promotion. For example, newspaper articles about an arena large enough for Ontario Hockey Association games to be played in, help to externally promote the quality of the recreational facilities available, and enhance the status of the locality. Likewise, recorded actions of people working together to develop a facility, help to internally promote identification with the locality.

Recreation is defined as "...activities or experiences carried on
within leisure, usually chosen voluntarily by the participant - either because of satisfaction, pleasure or creative enrichment derived, or because he perceives certain personal or social values to be gained from them."5 These activities or experiences may include competition, but this is not an essential characteristic. Leisure refers to "the portion of an individual's time which is not devoted to work or work connected responsibilities or to other forms of maintenance activity and which therefore may be regarded as discretionary unobligated time."6

Lastly, facilities are defined as structures and/or areas used for recreation. Public facilities are accessible to everyone and/or owned by the municipality.7 Private facilities are accessible to club members only, while semi-private structures and areas can be used by both club members and "pay as you play" participants. A facility which operated with the intent of making a profit is designated as commercial.

Justification

Boosterism and community spirit are topics which have received considerable investigation in terms of urban history and urban growth. Within these areas, some studies have focused upon recreation as a promotional tool for growth and development.8 Very few studies however, have examined to any extent the relationship between recreational facilities and community.9

Before investigating the relationship between recreational facilities and community, exploration of previous research into this association is conducted. The external aspect of community, boosterism,
and its role in locality growth is presented first. The role of recreation is examined within this context. Secondly, the internal aspect of community is presented. Community spirit, including involvement by businessmen, is discussed in relation to locality promotion. Once again the role of recreation is presented.

The relationship between growth of the locality and boosterism is one that has received a great deal of attention. Various investigations all imply that the activities of boosterism and "booster minded men" have helped with promotion of locality growth.10 Wichern states "that a local community's current welfare and future development depend on active efforts to promote the local features, and attract growth industries and real estate development."11 Potyondi and Voisey study this development within the small prairie town and the latter suggests that boosterism was an important aspect to consider in town histories.12

Boosterism is also directly connected with recreation. Cavett, Selwood and Lehr illustrate this relationship when they suggest that one feature used for promotion were parks, both green spaces and commercial amusement parks. Parks were thought to enhance the city's attractiveness and improve the quality of life. They were also thought to promote growth by increasing business prospects and property values, and provide an income through taxes and spending.13

Similar reasoning was also thought to be behind Ross's support for procurement of Vancouver's Stanley Park.14 Hardy also supports this concept. "Boston's top business firms favoured parks as grand advertisements of the city's commercial health and claimed that their beauty would attract wealthy merchants from around the globe."15 This philosophy was
also utilized in designing the Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition held in Seattle in 1909. This world fair, whose main feature was sports, was set up as a business proposition, designed specifically to create interest and focus attention on Seattle, in an attempt to establish it as a chief port and centre to Alaska and the Far East.\(^{16}\)

Citizen commitment to the locality is shown when community spirit and locality growth is examined. Careless states, "the city had to grow, by popular will and every individual citizen - in his private capacity - could and must share in making it grow."\(^{17}\) In dealing with the small town, Voisey states

> Even people who would not gain by it economically supported town promotion, for it inspired much more than greed... individuals derive much of their identity from where they live, and like the residents of Stephen Leacock's Mariposa, people in the small towns of Kipp and Aldersyole cried out for recognition in a world increasingly dominated by big cities. This craving explains the pride attached to home town baseball teams...\(^{18}\)

The role of the businessman in the relationship between community spirit and locality growth has also been examined. In discussing the growth of various towns, Acheson suggests that in each town there was

> A group of entrepreneurs possessing the enterprise and the capital resources necessary to initiate the new industries. Strongly community oriented, these entrepreneurs attempted, during the course of the 1880's, to create viable manufacturing enterprises in their local areas...\(^{19}\)

Potyondi also explores the role of the entrepreneur in community spirit and locality growth. He suggests that the 1890's were a time "particularly suited to those with entrepreneurial talents"\(^{20}\) and that town building at that time became a shrewd investment, and less of a speculative gamble. He
also states that town leaders "molded growth to their advantage whenever possible."\textsuperscript{21}

Lastly, community spirit has also been directly associated with recreation. McKee studies the actions of the improvement association in Kitsilano. He found that the residents of this locality headed a campaign to convince the city to acquire parkland at Kitsilano beach in an effort to upgrade their area. Kitsilano residents clearly felt that parkland was a required amenity for living there.\textsuperscript{22}

Although there have been studies dealing with the relationship between community and recreational facilities, such as the above by McKee, there has not been an extensive examination of the relationship. Because of this void, "community" was chosen as the avenue for investigation. Secondly since community is a naturally occurring phenomenon and has the ability to be pervasive throughout the locality, it was seen as being a potentially useful tool to aid in understanding the history of recreational facilities. Lastly, from the relationships found in previous research, it becomes obvious how the connections between recreation and community can manifest themselves and play a role in the development of facilities.

**Delimitations, Limitations, Methodology**

The site chosen for this investigation is the village of Stouffville. Work by both Artibise and Frisch imply why it is important to use Stouffville to examine the development of recreation facilities. They state that the developmental processes of small towns as well as large cities must be examined; these processes in one town, should give insights into other
Stouffville is predominantly an agricultural settlement; the first settlers established grist mills to serve the farms in the surrounding areas. Over time the village has grown to include commercial, residential and industrial sectors, while the surrounding agricultural area has remained. See Map 1-1 for location of Stouffville in relation to Toronto and the surrounding towns and villages.

Corresponding to the development of the village is the relative increase in population. The village's population statistics are presented in Table One. From these figures it was found that Stouffville is typical of the numerous small villages and towns of Ontario. For illustrations of the village's physical development, see Maps 1-2 to 1-4.

Lastly, a small rural village is chosen for this investigation since it presents a limited site for operation of community. More importantly, the functioning of community in this setting may occur without all residents being aware of it, while others, such as the newspaper editor, recognizing it as a powerful tool for development. These ideas are presented in the following:

It is a question of whether the average rural community appreciates the tremendous force that can be exerted through united effort along any line. Given a certain responsible and feasible purpose and design and the will to accomplish, there is little that cannot be accomplished through the hearty co-operation of a number of men and women who will work together in harmony. An individual can do much through sheer force of will and unflagging industry, but when a number of individuals bring to the accomplishment of an understanding all their resources of labour and determination, and work towards a common end in united and harmonious manner, they can do wonders. And a getting together of our Stouffville citizens that shall eliminate all factionalism, personal grievances, petty malice, and
TABLE ONE

Population of Stouffville\textsuperscript{25}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>1253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>3883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>11262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1877 - incorporation of Stouffville
1956 - annexation took place
1963 - annexation took place
1971 - incorporation of Town of Whitchurch - Stouffville on January 1.
jealousies, from everything pertaining to the general welfare of the town in a manufacturing, commercial and business way, will do more than has ever before been accomplished for it in any other manner. The key to the situation is united, harmonious action, a putting to the wheel of every shoulder, and the discarding of the besetting sins of selfishness, jealousy, political jangling, malice and knocking. Add to this a little further realization by everybody that he can do and should do his proper share according to his ability, to promote local interests, and there will be such public spirit that will accomplish great things.27

Similar ideas were reiterated thirty years later.

'One of the first things that struck me on entering this hall tonight was the sense of community spirit which prevailed,' so said W. A. Hewitt, the granddaddy of the Ontario Hockey Association in addressing the banquet audience for the Clippers on Thursday evening. And Mr. Hewitt's words rang true. Many times has your writer been told of the apparent fine community spirit and friendly atmosphere in Stouffville, something which is not always apparent to those who live possibly too close to it.28

Both examples provided by an editor of the Stouffville Tribune, show that community, potentially is an important element of the village, and thus could be used in this investigation.

The Stouffville Tribune is the main source of data used to research the development of recreational facilities. This paper is a weekly publication and every available issue of the newspaper from November 16, 1888 to December 31, 1970 is utilized. Since this is a newspaper study, the data is severely limited to not only what the editor perceived as important and newsworthy, but to the newspapers available. Due to a fire in the early years of the century, there are very few issues prior to 1923.29 Within each edition used, specific columns and pages are examined thoroughly, while other pages are scanned peripherally. The pages and col-
umn scrutinized most closely include the front page, editorials, letters to the editor, local happenings/events and the sports pages.

To collect the data, information about every known recreational facility in or near Stouffville is considered. Depending on the amount of coverage in the newspaper, the information gathered deals with development, maintenance and/or operation of the structure or area. The newspaper coverage is also examined for information about who was involved and why, and the process and outcomes of their actions. When all data has been collected, information is collated for each facility and a documented existence prepared.

The second step of analysis is to examine the accessibility and operation of each facility and to subdivide the structures and areas into like groups. Three subdivisions are chosen; public facilities, private and semi-private facilities, and commercial facilities. Not only do these groupings coincide with the divisions of the leisure service delivery system, but they also are believed to represent three different relationships with community. For example, since anyone could use public facilities, it is believed that community would be prevalent in the history of these structures and areas. Conversely, since only club members could use private structures, community is not expected. Likewise, since commercial establishments were businesses, Stouffvillians are expected only to use the areas and structures, not identify with them.

Once all facilities are subdivided, the presence of community for all facilities in each subdivision is detailed. This information, along with the documented histories is presented in Chapters 2, 3 and 4.

Lastly, in order to understand the relationship between all
recreational facilities and community, an examination of community is presented in Chapter 5. From this examination, conclusions about the investigation are drawn and presented.
Endnotes


2 To investigate the nature of the relationship between recreational facilities and community, it is necessary to assume that a relationship exists and that a change in one is associated with a change in the other.


4 See endnote 3.


6 Ibid., p. 44.

7 This definition was developed after consultation with Mr. Terry Fink, regional consultant with the Ministry of Tourism and Recreation.


12 Potyondi, "In quest of limited urban status: The town-building process in Minnedosa, 1879-1906"; Voisey, "Boosting the small prairie town, 1904-1931: An example from Southern Alberta".

13 Cavett, Selwood and Lehr, "Social philosophy and the early development of Winnipeg's public parks".

14 McKee, "The Vancouver park system 1886-1929: A product of local businessmen".

15 Hardy, "Parks for the people: Reforming the Boston park system, 1870-1915", p. 11.

16 Northam and Berryman, "Sport and urban boosterism in the Pacific northwest: Seattle's Alaska-Yukon-Pacific Exposition, 1909".


21 Ibid.

22 McKee, "The Vancouver park system 1886-1929: A product of local businessmen".


26 The number of villages with populations up to 1500 compared to the number of towns and villages with populations from 1000 to 4999, and to the number of towns, villages and cities with populations over 5000, illustrates this idea. Source: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Census of Canada (1951): 9-1 to 9-12; Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Census of Canada (1961): 2-28 to 2-29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Villages Up to 1500</th>
<th>Towns and Villages 1000 to 4999</th>
<th>Towns, Villages and Cities Over 5000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>55*</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>174**</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1000 to 1500 population
** up to 2000 population

28 Ibid., 15 May, 1952, p.11.

29 Between the years of 1888 to 1923, there were approximately two hundred newspapers available for use. Ibid., 16 March, 1967.

30 Leisure service delivery system is a term used in recreation to describe providers of organized recreation. Descriptions of this system are broken into classifications of providers. See Kraus, Recreation and leisure in modern society for an example.
CHAPTER II

PUBLIC FACILITIES

Recreation established roots in Stouffville, and in the lives of its citizens, well before the turn of the century. However, the pastimes enjoyed were of a sporadic nature. Areas and structures, such as open fields, Boyer's Pond, the Globe Hotel and the Queen's Hotel, were the facilities commonly used for recreational events. The first steps toward development of modern organized recreation in Stouffville, were encountered in the late 1900's, when specific recreational structures and areas were created. But, it was not until the twentieth century that these meager beginnings expanded and flourished. Life in Stouffville, after the turn of the century, offered a wide variety of recreational choices as public, private and commercial provisions were made.

This chapter will focus upon structures and areas which were used for recreation, and were considered to be of a public nature. Exploration of the presence of community in the history of these facilities will also be conducted. Public facilities were defined as being accessible to everyone and/or owned by the municipality. There were four types of public recreation facilities; common grounds used mostly for socializing, multi-use grounds for sports and play, a swimming beach and finally, school facilities. (See map 2-1.)
MAP 2-1
Public Facilities, 1888-1971

KEY:

- O Pre 1900
- ▲ 1900-1945
- □ 1946-1971 Development Times

1. Driving Park 1888-1900
2. Memorial Park 1911-1971
3. West Lawn Crescent Park 1959-1971
4. Loretta Crescent Park 1963-1971
5. Mussleman's Lake 1905-1947
6. High School 1953-1971
7. St. Mark's School 1965-1971
8. Orchard Park School 1965-1971
Common Grounds for Socializing

The Driving Park was one of the first areas in Stouffville to be developed with a specific recreation focus. Although the name implies a limited purpose, the leisure activities enjoyed here were of a broad nature. For example, in 1889 the park was used for lawn socials, band concerts and a baseball game. Boastful comments recorded in the Stouffville Tribune described the park as "beautiful and spacious." The Driving Park was established before 1888 and was used until the turn of the century, but it is unknown who developed it.

Multi-Use Grounds for Sports and Play

Prior to 1911, a children's playground did not exist, despite the need for such an area being recognized.

Another thing needed is a playground for the rising generation. The streets are not for that purpose and should not be used for the boys to display their agility and work off their superabundance of energy, but until a better place is provided what are they to do? Our village fathers should take the matter in hand and make provision for a public playground.

The land for Memorial Park was purchased by the Board of Trade in approximately 1911. The main reason for this development was provision of a play area for children. Five years later, Dr. Freel, who was a Board of Trade member, used the same rationale to induce the development of a toboggan slide. He stated that a slide should be built because of
the lack of winter sports for young people. A second slide was built in 1924 and used until 1926. Finances for this last slide were raised by the Board of Trade and Mr. Sidney Schmidt, operator of the Auditorium Theatre.  

By 1919 the concept of a multi-use park had changed. It was suggested that Memorial Park was no longer only for children. It was also stated that one function of the park was for sporting endeavours. "Baseball or football teams of our community are welcome at any time without charge, to use the park, for it is one of the main purposes the Board of Trade, who rent the park, state it is to be used for." Hence, the need for a children's playground expanded to become the need for a multi-purpose area for both adults and children to use.

In 1923 an expansion of Memorial Park was announced. That year Dr. Sangster stated that he would donate his adjoining property if the outstanding debts against the park were paid off. He was noted as saying "We must have grounds for our children to play." Two years later a concentrated effort was made to pay off the debts. It was argued that any money invested in the park would be a good financial decision. The reasoning behind this argument was the idea that the park would be an improvement and an asset to the village; the park would keep property and business values up and it would also keep the village "up to date." Within one month of announcing the campaign to raise the required money, canvassing of the village had raised over $1000. Thus in April, Sangster's Grove was given to Memorial Park despite the fact that the mortgage was not formally paid-off until August. Interestingly enough, when the Board of Trade gave Memorial Park to town council in March 1926, they
Sangster's Grove
Play Area, 1952
stated it was" ... to be held in trust by the council for the citizens as a public park and athletic field."\(^{12}\), even though the park had been acquired through the leadership and enterprise of a small group of citizens. (See plate 2-1.)

During the next thirty years, Memorial Park remained virtually unchanged. Cosmetic changes such as the location of the quoits and horseshoe pits, and the amount and placement of the playground equipment occurred, but major changes altering the function of Memorial Park did not. The park was still intended for young and old, and was used for both sporting and recreational pastimes.

Even the developments which occurred during the 1950's did not alter the function of the park. During a seven year period; Mr. Arthur Latcham, a wealthy entrepreneur, provided many items for the park. In 1953 he donated money for floodlights and a public address system,\(^{13}\) and in 1954 he provided funds for an additional twenty-eight floodlights, and a grandstand. Money for a picnic shelter and a refreshment booth was his gift in 1955, and in 1956 he gave money for a swimming pool. When the swimming pool was constructed, Mr. Latcham put the Lions Club in charge of its operation. Although an admission fee was charged, the pool was not a profit making operation, and eventually the Lions entered into a financial arrangement with council to "make ends meet." Finally, in 1959, Mr. Latcham added a wading pool.\(^{14}\) Although during the 1930's efforts had been made to establish a swimming pool, there had not been enough interest or support for one to be built.\(^{15}\) (See plates 2-2 and 2-3.)

The final development in Memorial Park also took place during
$8,000 GRANDSTAND FOR MEMORIAL PARK

Grandstand (1954) and Picnic Shelter (1955)
Donated By Mr. Arthur Latcham

NEW $4,000 PARK BOOTH TO BE OPENED SOON
Swimming Pool (1957) and Floodlights (1953)
Donated By Mr. Arthur Latcham
the 1950's. For three and a half years there were many discussions about the lack of a home run fence for the baseball diamond. One was finally built late in 1955.16

To understand the complete development of Memorial Park, maintenance of the park must also be examined. In its early years, when the Board of Trade owned the park, Stouffville's citizens and businessmen were asked to help with upkeep. "Citizens of Stouffville and the surrounding community are requested to come and assist in this one half day in the year, to improve your Memorial Park." In 1923 the half day clean up was designed to correspond to the weekly half holiday. Even after town council took over park ownership and established a Parks Commission to oversee maintenance, citizen involvement was still present. For example, in 1931 and again in 1932, "work bees" were held to prepare the baseball diamond for the coming season. In 1935, three men built a retaining wall along the bank of the creek to stop water from undercutting the tree roots. And starting in 1948, the Lions Club provided maintenance and equipment. The Kinsmen Club followed suit in 1965.18

Despite the involvement of Stouffville's citizens in the development, maintenance and use of Memorial Park, not everyone was positively affected by the existence of the park. Problems with vandalism recurred several times. In 1922 when Stouffville's citizens were being asked to help prepare Memorial Park for the Veterans Sports day, rewards were also being offered for information about people destroying park property. Vandalism problems occurred again in 1923, 1931, 1958, and 1970.19
During the sixty years that Memorial Park existed in Stouffville, many people were involved in its creation, development and maintenance. Of these people, several of them are known to have belonged to the business community. These businessmen included the members of the Board of Trade, Dr. Freel, Mr. Sidney Schmidt, Dr. Sangster and Mr. Arthur Latcham.

Memorial Park was not the only multi-use area to exist in Stouffville. During 1959, as a result of the Planning Act, three small parks were created. These parks were located on West Lawn Crescent, Maytree Avenue and Fairview Avenue. The latter two were smaller, and it was felt that the expenses for these lots were too costly. Thus they were sold in 1961 and 1962 respectively. In a manner similar to Memorial Park, citizens were actively involved with the development and maintenance of the West Lawn Crescent park. For example, the citizens were responsible for the outdoor skating rinks built there in 1959, 1961, 1962, 1964, 1969 and 1970. (See plate 2-4.) The Lions Club was also involved with development as they purchased playground equipment for the park in 1963 and 1970.

In 1963 another small park was established on Loretta Crescent. Its creation was the result of a petition circulated by the east end residents stating a need for a play area in their part of the village. The Lions Club was also involved with this park; they supplied playground equipment for it in 1970.
Outdoor Ice Arena is Well Patronized

1962 Ice Rink at
West Lawn Crescent Park
Swimming Beach

The first public beach known to be used by Stouffville's citizens was located at Musseleman's Lake. In 1905 the Union School held their annual picnic on this public shore. By 1913 overnight use had developed, as residents used tents to create a summer resort for themselves. Shortly thereafter, many private, residential and commercial developments began. Despite these developments, public shoreline was available until at least 1947.23

School Facilities

Although the first interscholastic events occurred in 1923, school facilities specifically designed for recreation were not built until 1953. This was the year that the high school, complete with gymnasium, was built. Before this gymnasium was available, events were held on the playing field, in a classroom "gymnasium" (which reverted to a classroom when needed), in Memorial Park and in Baker Brothers Arena.24 Seven years after the high school gymnasium opened, the athletic field was finally finished. In 1965 the gymnasium at Orchard Park and St. Mark's were built. Both of these developments indicate that Stouffville's citizens were placing an increased emphasis on the fitness of their children.25
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Discussion

From 1888 to 1971, common areas for recreation existed in Stouffville. These areas which included the Driving Park, Memorial Park, West Lawn Crescent Park and Loretta Crescent Park, were available consistently year around, as well as year after year. The only exception to this was between 1900 and 1911, when a common area did not exist.

The purpose of the common area appears to have changed over the period of time studied. Before the turn of the century, the common area was designed and mainly used for socializing. This finding is consistent with work by both Kraus and McFarland. Kraus states:

As in the United States, the philosophy of the early park planners was to provide scenic, secluded and natural open spaces and to exclude sports, entertainment or other recreational activities that might encroach on their vision of what a park should be.26

Although McFarland dealt with the urban environment, she supports the idea that the early parks were for socializing. She states:

At the close of the nineteenth century parks were generally thought of as 'breathing spaces' where people could stroll or drive their carriages in quiet serenity away from the dust and noise of the city proper.27

By 1911, the purpose of the common area was not only for socializing, but expanded to include children's play. A second expansion occurred in 1919 when it was stated in public that sporting activities were to be included as part of the purpose of the common area. The nineteenth century commons had become the twentieth century multi-use area.
As stated previously, these common areas were used year after year, throughout the entire year. Usually these areas were just an accepted aspect of life in the village. They were there to be used and enjoyed. Unless something of importance occurred on the common grounds, or if something was wrong with the area, such as being below the desired level of quality, then it was not mentioned on a consistent basis in the Stouffville Tribune. One example of discussions about the quality of facilities deemed to be necessary for living in the village was found with the home run fence for the baseball diamond.

Stouffville's citizens voiced their displeasure when the quality of a facility dropped too low, and they also raised their voices when they recognized the need for new recreational developments. The acquisitions of Memorial Park, Sangster's Grove and Loretta Crescent are examples of this type of action. More than just verbal protestations, in all three situations, Stouffville's citizens worked together in an effort to achieve a goal that they saw as a way of bettering their village. The best example of this community spirit occurred with the acquisition of Sangster's Grove. In 1925, when Stouffville's population was approximately 1093,\textsuperscript{28} it took just one month to raise the required $1000 to pay off the debts on Memorial Park. This meant that on a per capita basis, every man, woman and child would have given at least ninety-one cents to the cause!

Throughout the entire sixty years that Memorial Park was studied, community spirit played a major role not only in the park's development, but in its maintenance as well. The citizens of Stouffville bel-
ieved that Memorial Park was theirs, and they felt a responsibility to work together to ensure its' upkeep. These ideas of ownership and identification also explain the actions of the citizens with respect to the development and maintenance of West Lawn Crescent Park, and Loretta Crescent Park. Voisey supports these findings. He states that the citizens of small towns derive much of their identity from where they live and develop a pride in their towns.²⁹

Although many citizens demonstrated great community spirit throughout the history of Memorial Park,³⁰ an interesting twist occurred regarding the payment of the park's debts in 1925. Despite the fact that the park was meant for all of Stouffville's citizens, it was actually a small group of residents who led the fight to make the park debt free. This illustrates that community spirit, though initially small, can grow into a force large enough to sway the thinking of the locality and thus, is a powerful tool. However, as has been shown, not everyone is positively affected by community spirit. The recurring problems with vandalism represent this point.

The concept of boosterism was also evident in the behaviors of Stouffville's citizens. In contrast to the role of community spirit, boosterism was only used with the Driving Park. Although Stouffvillians were proud of their commons, it did not help with growth of the village. Instead the boosterism used, appeared to be in defense of the status of Stouffville and its' recreational developments. This finding does not correspond to either Wichern or Potyondi's findings, who both suggest that boosterism activities are positively related to locality growth.³¹
Another finding which does not correspond to previous research, are the actions of Mr. Latcham. Although Potyondi suggests that entrepreneurs made shrewd investments and molded town growth to their advantage whenever possible, it is not believed that Mr. Latcham did this. Although Mr. Latcham was an entrepreneur and investor, he was also a local citizen who cared about the locality in which he lived.

The actions of Stouffville's citizens toward all park areas, especially Memorial Park, show that a strong relationship existed between the parks and community. A sense of ownership appeared to aid in fostering the actions of community spirit and boosterism. For example, Stouffvillians voiced a need for parkland, and then worked together to acquire it. Once a park was created, they boasted about it, and worked together to ensure its' continued existence at a level of quality they deemed necessary. Stouffvillians demanded parks and they got them. Parks were an essential aspect of life in the village.

Mussleman's Lake, similar to Memorial Park, was used yearly, as well as throughout the entire year. Although Stouffville's citizens used and enjoyed the lake, actions depicting community were not displayed toward it.

Actions involving community spirit and boosterism were not evident in the development of school facilities. However, it is interesting to note that all recreation specific school developments occurred after 1950. Corresponding with this were the annexations which took place in the village. These occurrences suggest that new needs were identified as the population grew. Not only were more schools needed to serve the enlarged population, but also gymnasia were needed to provide for the phys-
ical fitness of the children of this new population. It was not until this time that the need for children's fitness was verbally recognized in the Stouffville Tribune.\textsuperscript{34}
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CHAPTER III

Private and Semi-Private Facilities

An examination of the relationship between recreational facilities and community, must also include the investigation of private and semi-private facilities. As Kraus states, "a major portion of recreational opportunity today is provided by private membership organization." These clubs have been described,

...as independent bodies, owning their own facilities, with policy set by elected officers and boards, and with the actual work of maintenance, instruction and supervision carried out by paid employees. A major characteristic of many such organizations is their social exclusiveness...

Private facilities were defined as being accessible to the club members only. Semi-Private facilities were accessible to both club members, and to "pay as you play" participants.

Private and semi-private facilities will be examined in this chapter. The presence of community, in the history of these facilities, will also be explored. There were six types of private and semi-private facilities which existed in Stouffville from 1888 to 1971. These included curling rinks, lawn bowling greens, tennis courts, community/music halls, golf courses and church sponsored facilities. (See map 3-1.)
MAP 3-1
Private and Semi-Private Facilities, 1888-1971

KEY:

1. Daley's Hall Curling 1888-1895
2. Curling Club 1922-1949
3. Rolling Hills Curling & Golf 1960-1968
4. Lawn Bowling 1904-1971
5. Tennis Courts 1924-1971
7. Masonic Hall 1954-1971
8. Sleepy Hollow Golf 1956-1971
9. Markham Golf 1959-1971
11. Youth Centre 1956-1971
12. Willow Springs 1959-1971
Curling Rinks

The first organized sport clubs in Stouffville were curling clubs. Over the time period examined, there were five clubs which were established or attempted. These clubs curled at Daley’s Hall (1888 to 1895), an unnamed rink (between 1895 and 1922), the Curling Club (1922 to 1949), Rolling Hills (1960 to 1968) and Stouffville Centennial Club (1967 to 1968).

Prior to 1888, Mr. R. J. Daley built Daley’s Hall, which included a curling rink on the ground floor. The club operating from here was very active, with intra-club competitions as well as competitions against rinks from Markham and Toronto. However, the curling club at Daley’s Hall was eventually forced to find a new location for its rink; in 1895, the weekly market expanded and took over the space which had previously been used for curling. Between 1895 and 1902, the curling club rink found a new location; however, the name and location are unrecorded. One possible location was the Maple Leaf Rink.

At a Board of Trade meeting in September 1922, discussions were held about building a new curling rink. During the ensuing three months, club members were solicited for fifty dollars each, and a shed which was to be used for the structure, was purchased from the Canadian National Railway. Land the rink was to be built upon was also donated by Mr. W. H. Todd. Club members then set about building the rink.

By December 1922, the rink was complete and open. During the next twenty-seven years, curling club members maintained and oper-
ated the rink. Only once, during 1948, was a statement made that club members were not doing enough to help with the upkeep of their club. In 1949, the rink was sold and the $500 sale price distributed to the original shareholders. These last two events suggest that interest in the game of curling may have been declining in Stouffville.

During the next twenty-two years, from 1949 to 1971, a curling rink did not exist in the village, despite two different attempts to create one. During the late 1950's, Mr. Arthur Latcham announced plans to build a curling rink on the land east of Memorial Park. This rink did not materialize, and in 1960 he announced a revised plan. In May of that year, Mr. Latcham appeared before council requesting permission to build a four sheet curling rink and golf club.

Rolling Hills Curling Club, located about five miles west of the village, was a semi-private club. Mr. Latcham sold this club sometime during the 1960's, and by 1968, interest in the game of curling declined for the second time in Stouffville. At that time, the new owner stated that the curling club at Rolling Hills would cease operation due to lack of membership, and inactivity during daytime hours. (See plate 3-1.)

The second attempt to create a curling rink in the village occurred during the late 1960's. In June of 1967, some businessmen announced a campaign to establish Stouffville Centennial Curling Club. Despite the strong curling background of the village and strong editorial support in the Stouffville Tribune, the promoters met with weak public support. Thus after eleven months, the campaign was halted. Once again the declining interest in the sport was obvious.
Rolling Hills Curling Rink

1960 - 1968
Lawn Bowling Greens

At the turn of the century, a second club activity was beginning to attract the interest of Stouffvillians. Lawn bowling made its debut in 1904, when a match was played against the village of Claremont. By 1916 the club had become very active. Thus it is believed that lawn bowling was played since 1904. A picture of the 1911 team, found on plate 3-2, substantiates this point. This increased activity was the reason for the expansion of the greens in 1922. Since the Board of Trade owned Memorial Park, and the bowling greens were adjacent to part of its northern limits, the bowling club approached the Board of Trade regarding the acquisition of fifteen extra feet of land beyond the southern limits of their greens. An agreement was reached and the land has been used ever since. (See plate 3-2.) It is unrecorded who originally developed the bowling greens.

To understand completely the development of the lawn bowling greens, the maintenance of the greens must also be examined. For a forty-eight year period, from 1923 to 1971, club members were chiefly responsible for upkeep of the facility. For example, during 1923 a grounds committee was established. "Work bees" were held for painting the clubhouse in 1923 and 1949, for erecting a clubhouse during 1933 and 1934, and for renovating the clubhouse in 1959. In 1964 club members installed electric lighting. However, on rare occasions, outside contractors were hired for maintenance jobs. One example of this was in 1965 when Mr. Leslie Morgason was hired to erect a new fence around the greens.

Members of the lawn bowling club participated in the development
PLATE 3-2

1911 Lawn Bowling Team

Lawn Bowling Greens and Clubhouse, 1970
and maintenance of their club because they wanted to participate in this sport in their village. The editor of the Stouffville Tribune also supported this view. "Instead of crying for continuous financial support, this group merely rolls up its sleeves and gets the job done."11 The village too promoted this attitude.

Such a thing as giving a grant to the Lawn Bowling Club is never dreamed of in Stouffville and rightfully so. It is not right to tax those who cannot afford to pay or who have no interest in the game to provide sport for grown-ups. Taxation to provide amusement for children may have its place, but never for the elder who are the money-earners ...who should pay for their own amusement...12

Over the sixty-seven year period that the bowling greens existed in Stouffville, it was the club members who were involved with development and maintenance. The members included men and women, living both in and out of Stouffville, and belonging not only to the business sector in Stouffville, but the agricultural sector in the surrounding locality as well.13

Tennis Courts

In contrast to both the 1922 curling rink and the lawn bowling greens, which were developed by members interested in playing the sport, the tennis courts in Stouffville were developed by businessmen, for use by younger citizens of the village. During 1924, the Board of Trade established the courts, which were located in Memorial Park. (See plate 3-3.) From 1924 to 1943 there was much interest in tennis, a fact evidenced by the clubs which formed every year. Similar to both the 1922 curling club and the lawn bowl-
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Tennis Courts 1924 - 1971

Wonderful Outdoor Rink Provided In The Local Park
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ing club, the tennis club members were a concerned group of people who wanted to play tennis and participated on a regular basis to ensure that the opportunity existed. "The Lawn Tennis Club have been doing some good work on the courts at the park, and the new surfacing promises to give fast, smooth courts which will be a delight to the members." Fund rais-
ers, as well as membership fees were used for these improvements.

In 1943 interest in the game of tennis declined. A major fac-
tor in this was the migration of Stouffville's youth to the Armed Forces and war plants.

The full expense of keeping the grounds in shape which has been carried for so long by the teen-
age members of the club, will now fall to the Parks Commission, which body it is hoped will at least preserve the grounds so that when these young people return, the task of renovating them will not be too great.

Despite this appeal, the courts were not maintained until the end of the Second World War.

During 1945, Mr. C. H. Bell and the Parks Commission put the courts in working order. It was suggested that the young people organize into a club to keep the sport active, and to prevent the courts from falling into disrepair. Despite a club being formed that year and in subsequent years, they never entirely maintained the courts as had the clubs before the war. As a result, the Parks Commission, along with the Lions Club and Stouffville Athletic Committee, took over court maintenance. On rare occasions, as in 1950, club members also helped with maintenance.

Despite ongoing provision of the tennis courts, interest again declined during the latter half of the 1950's. In 1956 the editor of the
Stouffville Tribune stated that not much success was met in organizing a club because it appeared "...everyone [was] too busy to help, to take any responsibility or even [have] time to recreate." It was not until 1965 that a tennis club was formed that functioned on a continuing basis. During 1970 the courts were resurfaced and floodlights installed. Funds for these improvements were made available through changes in provincial government legislation. This legislation enabled the use of grant money which had been allotted for development of new park lands, to be used for improving existing parks, provided there were sufficient parks to meet the population's needs.18

Coinciding with the upkeep by the Parks Commission, was the change occurring in the operation of the courts. During the winters of 1956, 1957, 1961 and 1970, outdoor skating rinks were created on the courts. The Parks Commission, along with volunteers, created and maintained these rinks.19

Community/Music Halls

Although commercially operated community halls were established shortly after Stouffville's incorporation, it was not until 1939 at a War Veterans Meeting, that plans were first discussed for building a memorial hall. Despite support from the editor of the Stouffville Tribune, it was not until 1946 that plans were finalized and citizen support was requested. Because citizen support was very difficult to procure, it was not until May of 1947 that the sod was turned. A year and a half later, the hall was opened. "Persistency and determination against great odds
displayed on the part of the members of Stouffville Legion have brought this fine memorial hall into existence." The Legion Hall was mainly used by the Veterans; however, it was also used for dances, bingos, badminton, and card games and tournaments.

Similar to the establishment of the Legion Hall was the development of the Masonic Lodge. During 1954, members of the Masonic Lodge supplied most of the labour and built this hall. Lodge functions, as well as euchre and bridge tournaments, were held here.

Golf Courses

During the 1950's, a new sport caught the interest of Stouffvillians. Development of the first facility for the game of golf began in 1956, and took five years to complete. Sleepy Hollow, located near the northern limit of the village, was a private club. Members of the club lived in the village, in the surrounding communities and in Toronto. By 1966 however, most members came from Toronto, while only about twenty-five members lived in Stouffville. It is not recorded who owned and developed this golf course.

In 1958 Mr. Arthur Latcham purchased property for Stouffville's second golf course. Work on this course, located about two miles south of the village, began in January 1959. Four months later, the course was officially opened. This course, Markham Golf and Country Club was initially a private club. Soon after the course opened, Mr. Latcham sold the club and it subsequently became semi-private. When Mr. Latcham repurchased the club in 1963, it was known as the Willows. Mr. Latcham continued the oper-
ation as semi-private, eventually re-selling the course.  

Rolling Hills Golf and Curling Club was the next golf course to be developed near Stouffville. The plans for this semi-private, twenty-seven hole course, were announced by Mr. Arthur Latcham during 1960. Mr. Latcham sold the course sometime during the 1960's.  

The last semi-private golf course developed near Stouffville was Meadowbrook. Meadowbrook, located about five miles west of the village, opened in 1961. Mr. Latcham was also responsible for this development and once again, during the 1960's he sold it. In 1969 an operational change occurred at Meadowbrook; during that year, fifty part owners were sought for course ownership. A private course, "owned and operated by the members for the members" was the result.

An interview conducted by Mr. Ken McKee of the Globe and Mail aids in understanding why Mr. Arthur Latcham, the main proponent of golf courses, developed them near Stouffville. "While he wasn't interested in playing the game himself, he knew that thousands of others were, and that Metropolitan Toronto did not have enough courses for what the financial pages refer to as the average man." Mr. Latcham also added, "I design golf courses because I like to, and for my family's benefit. I would like them to make money or sell them to advantage, but if not, it won't bother me too much." Another article about Mr. Latcham stated that he provided facilities "...so people could enjoy themselves in their own communities... He cared about the communities." Both articles show that Mr. Latcham was not only concerned about providing opportunities for recreation activities, but he was concerned about people enjoying themselves. His actions were strongly oriented to the locality.
Church Sponsored Facilities

Another form of recreation was also developed in the latter part of the 1950's, religious institutions being the forces responsible for their creation. Just after Christmas 1956, the Youth Centre opened. The centre offered activities such as skating on the pond, sleigh rides, toboggan sliding and indoor games. A second facility which opened near Stouffville was Willow Springs, a summer vacation camp operated by the Canadian Sunday School Mission. The land was purchased in 1959, and the camp itself opened two years later. Activities to take part in included baseball, swimming, fishing and gymnasium games. Both the Youth Centre and Willow Springs were available for use by Stouffville's churches.

Discussion

From 1888 to 1971, private and semi-private structures and areas for sport, recreation and socializing existed in Stouffville. These facilities were available consistently year after year, but were generally seasonal in nature and only used for parts of the year. The community halls, church facilities and tennis courts after 1956 were exceptions to this type of use.

Private and semi-private facilities were an accepted aspect of life in the village; they were available, used and enjoyed. These facilities received consistent recognition in the newspaper when major changes occurred in maintenance or operation of the facility, or when problems were encountered with the development of a structure or area. Maintenance of the
curling rink during 1948, operation of the tennis courts after the Second World War and development of the Legion Hall are good examples. In all situations, the discussions in the Stouffville Tribune dealt with the participation of Stouffvillians in the respective activities. These discussions reflected the view that it was necessary everyone in Stouffville know about the activities at the facilities, even if they did not belong to the clubs operating in them.

Private and semi-private facilities were not created as a result of actions of community spirit which stated a need for the facility. These actions also did not view the facility as a potential method of bettering the village. Instead, private and semi-private facilities were developed so Stouffvillians could partake of various sports in their village. Mr. Latcham's provision of golf courses illustrates this fact. Once these facilities were built, Stouffville's citizens participated to ensure the continuing availability of the sport. The evidence of citizen participation in the curling clubs, lawn bowling clubs and pre-war tennis clubs illustrates this idea. Groups of club members worked together to achieve a goal that they saw as internally promoting and bettering the village. Voisey's work supports these findings. He states that citizens supported town promotion because they developed pride and identity from where they lived.30

When examining the community spirit shown in relation to the development and maintenance of private and semi-private facilities, two characteristics are noted. Firstly, actions illustrating community spirit were carried out for the good of the club, and not necessarily to benefit the whole locality. However club members believed their actions directed towards their club, potentially bettered the entire village. Secondly, both the proc-
ness of working together in groups and the characteristic of achieving a common goal for internal promotion and/or betterment of the locality, are necessary to foster the relationship between community spirit and recreation facilities. The actions of the lawn bowlers illustrate this fact. They often worked together to maintain their facility; a goal which they saw as bettering Stouffville. Thus a relationship between the facility and community appeared to exist. Conversely, Mr. Latcham's actions exemplifying the characteristic but not the process of community spirit, reveals that a relationship between the facility and community did not exist. Likewise, the concept of boosterism was not evident in the actions of Stouffville's citizens with regard to private and semi-private facilities. Stouffvillians may have been boastful about their clubs, but this was not recorded in the Stouffville Tribune.

When considering the total relationship between private and semi-private facilities and community, several characteristics are revealed. For instance, over the time period studied, instead of simply one type of facility being essential to life in the village, the need for various types of private and semi-private facilities changed. For example, as the demand for curling rinks decreased, a corresponding demand for golf courses occurred. These changes were not only a reflection of the changing interests of Stouffvillians, but also an indication of the technological developments which were occurring in society. As things such as the automobile and the television became part of the lives of Stouffville's citizens, their leisure pursuits often changed to include these new developments.

After the 1950's the availability of the automobile meant that
Stouffville's recreation facilities belonged to more than Stouffvillians. The close proximity of Toronto, in combination with an efficient mode of transportation, meant that club members no longer shared the same background. Although participants shared the same sporting interests, the ability of Stouffvillians to belong to a club which was just for their village, no longer existed. The sense of identification and ownership within the village also changed. As a result, actions illustrating community and community spirit were not as pervasive, and not evident on the pages of the Stouffville Tribune. Sleepy Hollow golf course is representative of this finding.

Corresponding to both changing leisure interests, and the availability of the automobile, was the fact that starting in the 1950's, Stouffvillians began looking outside the village limits for their recreation. The attraction of golf courses and cottages drew citizens away from Stouffville during their leisure time. The decline of interest in tennis illustrates this fact. Corresponding to this, is a decline in community spirit and a change in what the village of Stouffville meant to its citizens. Stouffville was no longer an all encompassing term to the residents. They still lived and worked there, but they did not necessarily play there anymore. Interestingly enough, this change occurred at the time that Stouffville's population was expanding.

By the 1950's funding by members and commercial participants was no longer the only source of revenue. As was the situation with the tennis courts, the use of public monies for a private facility represented this dramatic change. Once again, this shows the decline in community spirit, and the resulting method of operation necessary to ensure continued
existence of the tennis courts.  

Finally, it was found that the businessmen of Stouffville played a central role in the relationship between private and semi-private facilities and community. Not only did these men decide what was needed and developed the facilities, but they were also the people who maintained and used them. The businessmen believed their actions were for the good of all of Stouffville. They also believed that it was essential to provide sport and amusement for the younger members of the village. The businessmen were central to the history of private and semi-private facilities and the relationship which existed between these facilities and community. The only exception to this finding was lawn bowling; although the businessmen were involved, so were the women of the village, and both the men and women of the surrounding agricultural area. The actions demonstrating community spirit however, were displayed predominantly by the businessmen of the village.
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CHAPTER IV

Commercial Facilities

An attempt to understand modern, organized recreation would not be complete without investigating commercial recreation in Stouffville. Kraus states, "By far the largest amount of recreational participation in the United States and Canada today is offered by commercial enterprises."\(^1\) He further states that this commercial expansion began during the 1920's and was part of the total recreation expansion.\(^2\)

Commercial facilities were defined as profit oriented. Examination of these facilities and the presence of community in their existence will be examined in this chapter. Eight types of commercial facilities existed in Stouffville from 1888 to 1971. There were fairgrounds, rinks and arenas, multi-purpose halls, bowling and billiard halls, dance pavilions theatres, a golf course and a conservation area. (See map 4-1.)

Fairgrounds

The fairgrounds, similar to the Driving Park,\(^3\) were one of the first areas in the village to be developed with a specific recreation focus. These grounds were designed and used for agricultural competitions and exhibitions. From 1889 to 1901, the Whitchurch - Stouffville Agricultural
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fairgrounds 1889-1904
2. Daley's Hall & Skating 1888-1923
3. Stouffville Skating Rink 1895-1906
4. Maple Leaf Rink 1901-1926
5. Baker Brothers Arena 1926-1949
7. Winter Wonderland 1963-1965
8. Auditorium Hall; Stouffville Recreation Centre; & Auditorium, Stanley & Park Theatres 1903-1959
9. Ratcliff's Hall 1910-1944
10. Collard's Block Bowling 1910
Society held their fall fairs here, but the fairs were not the only use of these grounds. To create a financially viable enterprise, other activities including lacrosse, football, baseball and horse racing matches took place at the fairgrounds. The Sporting Club also rented the grounds for their purposes. The fairgrounds were used until at least 1904. It is unknown who developed and operated the fairgrounds.  

Rinks and Arenas

Over the eighty-three years studied, there were six rinks and arenas which existed in the village of Stouffville. These ice surfaces, used for both hockey and skating, included Daley's Skating and Curling Rink (1888 to 1895), Stouffville Skating Rink (1895 to 1906), Maple Leaf Rink (1901 to 1926), Baker Brothers Arena (1926 to 1949), Stouffville Arena Limited (1949 to 1971) and Winter Wonderland (1963 to 1965). (See plates 4-1 to 4-3.)

Mr. R. J. Daley built Daley's Hall in 1885; Daley's Skating Rink was located in the basement of this hall. First known to exist in 1888, the rink was used for skating and masquerade carnivals. In 1895, Mr. Daley was forced to discontinue operation of the rink, as the weekly market expanded and took over the space.

Stouffville Skating Rink was established by Mr. R. J. Daley as a result of the closure of Daley's Skating Rink. During its construction, boastful comments were recorded in the Stouffville Tribune.
PLATE 4-2

Stouffville Skating Rink

Admission—Skaters, 15 cts.; Spectators, 5 cts.
Skates for Hire, 10 cts. per pair.

SEASON TICKET RATES.

Gentlemen ................................................................. $2.25
Ladies ................................................................. 1.75
Boy or girl (under 14 years) ......................................... 1.75
Family—two persons .................................................. 3.50
Family—three persons ................................................ 4.00
Family—four persons ............................................... 4.50
Family—five or over .................................................. 5.00
Ticket good for one night per week ......................... 1.25
Fifteen admission tickets ........................................ 1.50
(Carnivals excepted.)

Skating every Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday evenings, when ice is in good condition.

Stouffville Skating Rink 1895-1906

Maple Leaf Rink 1901 - 1926
Mr. R. J. Daley has a large staff of workmen engaged this week getting his mammoth skating rink in shape for the coming season. The rink is being made a little smaller to allow putting a roof on, which will make it more comfortable. Notwithstanding the fact that it is being made a little smaller, it will still be the largest covered rink in the province, being 80 feet in width and 206 feet in length. 7

Stouffville Skating Rink, also known as the Princess Rink, was used for skating, carnivals and Ontario Hockey Association (O.H.A.) hockey. Mr. Daley sold this rink before it was destroyed by fire in 1906. 8

Not only were Stouffvillians very proud of where they skated, but they also loved to skate. A rising demand for skating time brought about the establishment of a second ice palace in Stouffville at the turn of the century. Maple Leaf Rink was developed by Mr. Nathan Forsyth in 1901. Mr. Forsyth however, did not operate the rink. Instead, several other people, including Mr. Robert McKinnon and Mr. Clayton Baker, rented and operated the rink, Mr. McKinnon having previously managed one of Mr. Daley's rinks. Due to the small size of Maple Leaf Rink, it was initially used only for skating, carnivals, broomball and the occasional hockey game. After Stouffville Skating Rink was destroyed, all hockey functions were conducted in Maple Leaf Rink. However, when this happened, Stouffville was unable to have an O.H.A. team due to the small ice surface. 9

By 1922, discontent was expressed about the lack of an O.H.A. team, and an ice surface large enough for one to play on. The turning point in developing a new rink occurred after a comparison was made in March 1926: "With Unionville in the big rink business, Stouffville is the only place of any size in this section without a rink large enough to
meet O.H.A. and other requirements for winter sports." Maple Leaf Rink closed for the last time at the end of the 1926 season.

Stouffville’s new O.H.A. arena, Baker Brothers Arena, was developed in the fall of 1926. Although the arena was owned by Mr. Clayton Baker and his brother, the leading forces in its construction were Stouffville’s citizens and government. "Many may recall the opening of the Baker Arena and the 'bees' instituted by farmers and townspeople to erect the building."

In addition to the "work bees," the Parks Commission gave the Bakers free use of the land, in return for summer use of the building. The end result was an arena which was opened just two months after the plans were announced.

Bakers Arena was designed for both hockey and skating, and was described as having "...superior ice space to that of Markham and Uxbridge rinks for hockey purposes." During the opening ceremonies on Christmas Day 1926, Mr. Baker was complimented "...on his splendid enterprise in undertaking the erection of so large a building, filling a long felt gap in the town's requirements." Both comments show that Stouffville's citizens felt they required a substantial ice palace, one on which an O.H.A. team could play.

Although this O.H.A. arena existed, Stouffville's citizens were not always interested in playing O.H.A. hockey. Often times, bush league hockey was played instead, for example, in the winters of 1930, 1931 and from 1937 to 1945. Other winter activities included skating, carnivals and broomball. Summer uses consisted of box lacrosse, donkey baseball, adult physical training classes and "...lots of big things that otherwise would never be."
PLATE 4-3

Baker Brothers Arena 1926-1949

Stouffville Arena Limited 1949-1971

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
By March 1949, Mr. Baker had decided to dispose of the arena. Concurrent to this action, Stouffvillians were discussing an arena with artificial ice. Subsequently in June 1949, Baker Brothers Arena was sold, torn down and erected in another village. By the spring of 1949, the villagers were no longer simply talking about an artificial ice arena; instead they were ready to take action.

Stouffville Athletic Club initiated the development of Stouffville Arena Limited by setting up a public meeting regarding the idea of a community-owned arena, but it was Stouffville's citizens who were responsible for the development. Within one month of the public meeting, the original goal of $50,000 capital was surpassed. After the joint stock company was formed, it was decided to erect a new building instead of modifying Bakers Arena. Thus the company set a new capitalization goal of $100,000. Not wanting to miss any opportunities, the village council also became involved. In June 1949, council granted a life lease for the land, to the Arena Company.

Despite this action, the arena was still seen as belonging to the villagers. In August their involvement was described as follows.

"...The response of the local citizens has turned the project into a real community undertaking..." The following month citizen involvement was noted again in the Stouffville Tribune.

Another happy feature about this big ice palace is the fact that it is being built by private subscription instead of by ratepayers of the municipality. Even over in Newmarket the best they accomplished by public subscription was to raise $10,000. Now they are asking council to donate $26,000 additional for the ice plant to be built in the old rink. Aurora wants a rink and they decided to tax the people direct for it. So it is seen that Stouffville, as we said at the outset, is accomplishing something that probably has not been put over anywhere else that we are aware of.
Premier Frost officially opened the arena in December 1949.

During the next twenty-two years (1949 - 1971), the arena provided year-round recreation activities. Bingos, dances and commercial wrestling were frequently held during the summers, while hockey, skating and figure skating (as of 1951) filled the winter schedule. The $20,000 mortgage was paid off in 1959 and funds for improvements and maintenance were made available by putting the following year's profits into a sinking fund. Maintenance was also aided through "work bees." One example of this was when the shareholders painted the inside of the arena in 1952. Beginning 1963, the first dividend was paid to the shareholders.

The last commercial rink developed in Stouffville was unrelated to the other commercial ice palaces. The creation of the Winter Wonderland rink was instead related to the increasing popularity of small outdoor skating rinks which were being established in the public parks. Winter Wonderland, sometimes known as the Deer Park Ice Arena, was built by Mr. W. D. Atkinson in 1963. Ice times were available for skating, hockey and carnivals. The rink was known to be used until at least January 1965.

Multi-Purpose Halls

Soon after the incorporation of Stouffville, the villages first multi-purpose halls were built. These commercial establishments included Daley's Hall, the Auditorium and Ratcliff's Hall. These halls were used for numerous events and activities, including village council meetings, public meetings, talks, Christmas concerts and variety shows. Daley's Hall was developed by Mr. R. J. Daley prior to 1888, and used until destroyed by fire.
on February 9, 1923.

The Auditorium was known to exist soon after the turn of the century and was used as a hall until 1923. During that year the building was leased and transformed into a theatre. It is unrecorded who originally developed the Auditorium.

Ratcliff's Hall was also developed around the turn of the century. Although it is unknown when this hall was established, or by whom, it was known to exist as early as 1910, and was used until 1944. At that time, village council refused to renew the hall's license for safety reasons. This action came shortly after the provincial government transferred licensing authority to the municipalities. Soon after this, the provincial government also transferred authority to erect multi-purpose halls to the municipalities.

Bowling and Billiard Halls

In 1910 five pin bowling made its debut in Stouffville. The first alleys in the village were located in the eastern half of the Collard's Block building. It is unrecorded how long these alleys existed or who operated them.

Stouffville Recreation Centre was the second establishment to offer bowling. This centre, located on the ground floor of the Auditorium Hall, operated from 1929 to 1933. In March 1933, Stouffville Recreation Centre was forced to close, as the Auditorium Hall was sold and the new owner wanted to renovate the entire building.

Bowling did not reappear in the village until twenty years
later. In 1952 Arena Bowling and Snack Bar, under the operation of Mr. Cy Bellman and Mr. Wally Jennings, opened its doors. This three lane facility once again offered five pin bowling in Stouffville. By 1962, the demand for bowling had become so great that the new owner, Mr. C. H. Tuck, was forced to double the size of the alleys. By 1971, interest in bowling had spread to all ages of Stouffvillians and Mr. Tuck responded by providing leagues for all age groups.30

The last alleys developed in the area were located at Winsome Corner at Mussleman's Lake. Bowling existed here from 1953 until at least 1962. It is unrecorded who developed and operated these alleys.31

The development of billiard halls was not as sporadic as the establishment of the bowling alleys. From 1929 to 1933, the operator of Stouffville Recreation Centre provided billiard tables as well as bowling alleys. When this centre closed, the billiard license was transferred to another hall in 1933. During the next fifteen years, this same business was sold several times. Various owners included Mr. Pickett, Mr. O'Sulky, Mr. H. Anderson, Mr. Forsyth and Mr. K. Laushway. In 1944 another billiards license was granted by the village council. This license was given to the Mansion House, then known as the Village Inn. The last billiard license given by council was in 1969 when a hall was created in the old Anglican church on Main Street.32

Dance Pavilion and Resorts

Mussleman's Lake, located about five miles north of the village of Stouffville, was the location of many dance pavilions and two res-
orts. Although the lake area was a hamlet of its own, it was also a popular recreation area for Stouffville's citizens. Stouffvillians began travelling to the lake for recreation purposes soon after the turn of the century.

In 1916 the first dance pavilion at Mussleman's Lake was established when Cedar Glenn Park pavilion was built. By August of that year Stouffville's Young Peoples Group were holding dances there on every second Friday. Sometime during the next thirteen years, Cedar Glenn Park became a true summer resort as the swimming beach, sports grounds and hotel were developed. Twenty-five years after the first pavilion was built, Mr. Coultice announced plans to build a new dance pavilion. However due to the war, it was not until six years later, in 1947, that these plans materialized. At this point, Cedar Glenn Park became known as Glendale and was considered a prime dance pavilion. In 1970, boasters claimed Glendale had the second largest dance floor in North America. 33

Besides the developments at Cedar Glenn, there were several other establishments at Mussleman's Lake. They included, Cedar Beach (1923 to 1971), McNaughton's (1925), Baker's (1926 to 1928), Connor's (1928 to 1934), Moon Haven (1943), Sun Valley (1944 to 1961 and 1964 to 1966) and Winsome Corner (1946 to 1957). Although most of these pavilions existed sporadically, Cedar Beach park existed continuously and competed with Cedar Glenn for Stouffville's business.

The land for Cedar Beach was purchased by George Davies in 1923. It was not until 1931 however, that the first dance pavilion was opened on this site. (See plate 4-4.) Two years later Davies expanded the pavilion. "This will perhaps provide the largest dance floor at any
Cedar Beach Park and Dance Pavilion

1923 - 1971
The expansion was not just a reflection of the popularity of Cedar Beach pavilion. Instead it was a reflection of the popularity of the lake.

Twenty years ago Muzzleman's Lake was used by only a few people as a summer place, by pitching tents on the south shore, but steadily each year it has grown in importance as a summer resort, until today there are 250 cottages, and as it is shown by the building now contemplated the lake has not reached its zenith as a summer place for city folk to gather at.

The "zenith" for Cedar Beach probably occurred during the late 1930's and early 1940's. During these years, crowds between 5,000 and 9,000 were known to gather there for civic holiday celebrations in August. In 1957, Mr. Davies' son Vern and his wife, took over ownership of Cedar Beach resort. Seven years later in 1964, they winterized the dance pavilion to provide year around dancing.

Theatres

In the spring of 1923 an entrepreneur from Toronto visited the village of Stouffville to investigate the establishment of a motion picture house. In the fall of that year, after an upgraded hydro system was installed in the village, Mr. Sidney Schmidt leased the Auditorium as a movie house for showing silent films. Mr. Schmidt established a close relationship with Stouffville, and within one month, began presenting movies, together with the Board of Trade, to raise funds for a children's toboggan slide.

In July 1931, the Department of Theatres closed the Auditorium...
Theatre since it no longer met their regulations. When the theatre closed it was stated that there was a sizeable drop in the number of people going to town on Thursday and Saturday nights.\(^37\) It was also stated that "There are plenty of people here who are of the opinion that such a business would be a paying venture for someone with the capital to establish it."\(^38\)

In November 1932, Mr. Schmidt decided to try the movie business again. Lacking the capital for this venture, he said he would remodel the Auditorium if fifty citizens would support him for ten dollars each. To help promote citizen involvement he reminded the citizens that shopkeepers would profit by the people coming to the village and that it would "... tend to keep the young people in our community, whereas now they motor to neighbouring towns and the city, for this class of entertainment."\(^39\) Despite financial support being quickly given, it was not until March 1933 that the Auditorium was finally sold to Mr. Schmidt and the renovations could begin. While the construction was being completed, there was, once again, boasting about the facility. "It is estimated that when work is completed Stouffville Theatre will attract patrons for many miles in all directions..."\(^40\) "Few theatres outside the larger centres will compare with the up-to-date 'Stanley' in Stouffville."\(^41\) In July 1933, the Stanley Theatre opened. (See plate 4-5.)

During the next twenty-two years of operation, the relationship between Mr. Schmidt, the Stanley Theatre and Stouffville grew deeper. Many times the proceeds from shows were given to various organizations, or free shows were provided for the children of the locality. These activities helped to promote comments like the following. "Stanley Theatre plays an important role in the community scheme, and has done much in putting Stouff-
Auditorium Hall (upstairs) 1903-1923
Auditorium Theatre (upstairs) 1923-1931
Stouffville Recreation Centre (ground floor) 1929-1933
Stanley Theatre 1933-1955
Park Theatre 1957-1959
ville on the map as the hub of interest for an exceedingly wide and fertile area."42 "As a factor in bringing crowds of people to town, the Stanley Theatre plays an important role and has done much in placing the community on the map as a hub of interest for the district."43 The last free theatre party for children was provided in 1945. Four years later, the first major change in operation occurred. That year the Stanley Theatre came under management of Odeon Theatres, though Mr. Schmidt was retained as projectionist. In December 1955 the Stanley Theatre closed. Mr. Schmidt cited competition from television and the arena in the winter as the reasons.44

In February 1957, the Stanley was sold, but reopened nine months later as the Park Theatre. By 1959, the theatre was back on the market. The village council purchased the building at this time for use as municipal offices.45

Golf Course

The last golf course which was developed near Stouffville was Bethesda Golf Course. Opening in 1963, it was built and originally operated by Mr. Arthur Latcham. Bethesda Golf Course operated on a "pay as you play" basis, and developed because of the growing popularity of the game of golf, and the increasing demand for facilities on which to play. By 1971, Mr. Latcham sold the course.46

Conservation Area

In 1963, the Metro Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
released its master plan. According to it, the mill pond at Bruce's Mill, located about four miles west of the village was to be changed into a swimming pond. Although flood control was the main reason behind the change, auxiliary recreational activities were promoted. In the summers, Bruce's Mill was used for swimming and picnics, while winter activities included cross country skiing, tobogganing and skating. The conservation area officially opened in July 1965.47

Discussion

From 1888 to 1971, commercial structures and areas for sport, recreation and socializing existed in Stouffville. These facilities were available consistently year after year, and were characterized as being available for use both seasonally as well as all year around.

Commercial recreation facilities were an accepted aspect of life in the village. They existed within or near the village, and the citizens of Stouffville not only used them, but made them part of their lives. An illustration of this is seen in the Stouffville Skating Rink and the Maple Leaf Rink; from 1901 to 1906, both coexisted within the village. This coexistence becomes even more marked when it is noted that the population of the village at this time was 1200. Acceptance of the commercial rink as part of the village is also shown by the free use of land given to the Bakers when they developed Baker Brothers Arena, and also by the life lease on the land for Stouffville Arena Limited which was granted by the village council.

Though commercial recreation establishments provided opportun-
ities for Stouffville's citizens, these facilities were not usually discussed or even mentioned in the Stouffville Tribune. The rinks and arenas, the Stanley Theatre and the resorts at Mussleman's Lake were exceptions to this. These commercial facilities received recognition in the newspaper when the citizens identified a need which the current facilities were unable to fulfill, or when the citizens made statements about the quality of the existing facilities. Discontent about the small size of Maple Leaf Rink, and the lack of artificial ice in Baker Brothers Arena, represent needs not met. But comments about the size of the dance floors at Cedar Beach and Glendale, and the improvements at the Stanley Theatre, dealt with the quality of Stouffville's recreational facilities.

Not only did Stouffville's citizens complain when a recreational facility fell below the desired level of quality, but they also worked together to alleviate the situation. The development of Baker Brothers Arena and Stouffville Arena Limited are examples of this action. The development of the Stanley Theatre was similar; however with the theatre, Stouffvillians responded to the need for development, and not to improving the quality of a facility. In all three situations, Stouffville's citizens displayed community spirit by working together to achieve a goal that they saw as a way of improving their village.

Boosterism also played a part in the actions of Stouffville's citizens. Similar to community spirit, boosterism was used in relation to Baker's Arena, Stouffville Arena Limited and the Stanley Theatre, as well as with Glendale Park, Cedar Beach Park and Stouffville Skating Rink. In all situations, excepting Stouffville Arena Limited, boosterism promoted the quality of the facility; the boosterism involved with Stouffville Arena
Limited dealt with the process used for development. Although boosterism helped to promote the quality of recreation facilities which were available in Stouffville as well as promoting the status of the locality, it did not help to promote locality growth. This finding does not correspond with research conducted by Wichern, Voisey, Potyondi or Rudin, all of whom suggest that the activities of boosterism have helped promote locality growth. Instead the boosterism recorded, defended the status of Stouffville as a village and as a place which the citizens could be proud of.

When considering the relationship between commercial recreation facilities and community, it is interesting to note that an association does indeed exist. The lack of ownership of commercial facilities by the citizens of the village would suggest that a relationship may not be present. However, despite commercial circumstances, Stouffvillians established a strong sense of identification and pride in their village and its recreational facilities. Stouffville Skating Rink, Baker Brothers Arena, Stouffville Arena Limited and the Stanley Theatre are representative of this identification and pride. The existence of the three ice surfaces allowed Stouffville to have O.H.A. teams, while the existence of the theatre gave Stouffville a chance to show off the village to its neighbours. In all four situations, Stouffvillians believed the benefits gained from the existence of the facility outweighed the cost of their participation. Research conducted by Voisey supports these ideas.

Closely related to the fact that a strong relationship existed between Stouffville's ice palaces and community, is the fact that ice surfaces continually existed in Stouffville from 1888 to 1971. Stouff-
ville's citizens not only developed pride and identity from these structures, but they also demanded them, developed them, used them, maintained them and boasted about them. The ice surfaces helped promote Stouffville within Stouffville, and they also publicized Stouffville outside of the locality. A sense of identification and pride in the rinks and in the O.H.A. teams which played on them, appeared to aid in fostering this community spirit and boosterism. The rinks and arenas were essential to life in the village.

Another influencing factor on the relationship between commercial recreation facilities and community is the automobile. Although Stouffvillians began looking beyond the village limits for recreation soon after the turn of the century, it was not until the 1920's that significant numbers of Stouffvillians began to do so. The large number of dance pavilions at Musleman's Lake supports this idea. After 1950, further recreational developments requiring Stouffvillians to use an automobile to get there, occurred. This factor aided in decreasing citizens' sense of identification and pride in the village.

Also because of the automobile, by 1930, Stouffville's recreation facilities belonged to more than Stouffvillians. The close proximity of Toronto, in combination with an efficient mode of transportation, aided in producing a decrease in the sense of identification the citizens had with their facilities. Consequently, actions illustrating community spirit were not recorded in the Stouffville Tribune. The establishments of Mussleman's Lake, Bethesda Golf Course and Bruce's Mill are all representative of this fact.

The relationship between commercial facilities and community
was also affected by the changing leisure interests of Stouffvillians. The closure of the Stanley Theatre in 1957 supports this finding. Not only were Stouffville's citizens more interested in activities at the arena, but television also had a major effect on the theatre's business. The establishment of Bethesda Golf Course was also a result of the changing leisure interests of Stouffvillians.

Another characteristic central to the relationship between commercial facilities and community, were Stouffville's businessmen. The businessmen developed these facilities, except for the fairgrounds and Baker Brothers Arena, for all of Stouffville's population to use. In both these instances, the farmers of the surrounding locality played a central role with the developments.

Finally it was found that the number of different types of commercial facilities doubled during the 1920's. This finding supports work by Kraus.50
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CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions and Recommendations

The central purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between recreational facilities and community in Stouffville, from 1888 to 1971. In order to examine this relationship a three step investigation was conducted. It was necessary to know as much as possible about these facilities, including their development, maintenance and operation. Thus, the first step was to document the history of recreational structures and areas in and near Stouffville. The second step of investigation was to detail the presence of community in enhancing or impeding development, maintenance and/or operation of the facilities. Lastly, in order to understand the relationship between recreational facilities and community, the concept of community with respect to all facilities, was examined.

For the purpose of this study, community manifests itself as community spirit and boosterism. Community spirit referred to people working together to achieve common goals. It was the belief of Stouffvillians that these goals bettered and/or internally promoted the village. Boosterism referred to externally directed efforts to promote the locality. The internal aspect, community spirit, and the external aspect, boosterism, were chosen for they provided two different angles for viewing community.
The analysis of this relationship was conducted by sub-dividing the facilities into three categories; public, private and semi-private, and commercial facilities. Each category was determined by the accessibility to, and operation of, the structures and areas. Within each category, a documented history of each facility was developed. The next step explored, in relation to community, who was involved with these developments and why. The results of these analyses have been presented in the previous three chapters. This examination then investigates the two elements of community, community spirit and boosterism, while also focussing on the businessmen of Stouffville, an element which was found to be central to all three categories of facilities.

Community Spirit

The internal aspect of community was provided by examining the concept of community spirit. Although community spirit had been defined as identification, commitment and/or responsibility by local residents to the locality, it was found to be much more complex. Actions displaying this spirit were much deeper than mere association. Living in Stouffville and being part of the life of the village fostered a deep kinship between the people, its structures and the activities conducted in the village. Living in Stouffville meant being a Stouffvillian in every sense of the word. The community spirit shown toward the recreational facilities was a good representation of this fact.

Over the time period examined, community spirit was usually unobtrusive in village life. It existed but was usually shadowed by
everyday affairs. Only at certain times did the forces created by community spirit emerge and develop great strength. During these times, goals which had been stated, were usually attained. The actions displayed during acquisition of Memorial Park, Sangster's Grove, Loretta Crescent Park, Baker's Arena and Stouffville Arena Limited are representative of this.

In all situations, the residents responded to statements that these amenities were required for living in the village, and then worked together to acquire them. Citizens of Stouffville felt that parks and arenas were essential recreational facilities.¹

Community spirit also emerged when the citizens felt a sense of ownership of the recreational structures and areas. During these times, actions prompted by community spirit, were employed in maintenance of facilities. Once again, citizen involvement with the parkland was representative. Identification and pride in the parks fostered the emergence of community spirit.²

Related to the fact that community spirit only became obtrusive at certain times, was the fact that the citizen's sense of community spirit was displayed differently with each subdivision of facility. For examples, actions prompted by community spirit and displayed toward the public parks, were for the good of all of Stouffville. The actions were preceded by claims stating that the quality of existing facilities was too low or that the amenity was required by the citizens. The residents then worked together to create a better Stouffville. Conversely, similar actions displayed by club members were only for the good of the private recreation clubs. The members worked together to ensure continued opportunity of the activity. In general, actions created by community spirit were not evident with commercial
facilities, the theatre and rinks being exceptions. In both of these situations, the actions fostered by community spirit were generally for the benefit of children. Thus for the most part, the only actions representing true community spirit were found with public facilities; citizens of Stouffville worked together to achieve a goal for the good of the entire village.

Just as community spirit emerged and faded in Stouffville, so did the nature of the spirit change. At times it was strong, at other times it was weak. For example, with the development of Memorial Park and specifically with the acquisition of Sangster's Grove actions fostered by community spirit were very powerful, the response being both quick and strong. By 1950 however, the sense of community spirit had changed. What it meant to live in Stouffville and to be a Stouffvillian had changed as the village was increasingly drawn within the orbit of Toronto.³

The changing nature of community spirit during the 1950's, was also found in conjunction with Mr. Arthur Latcham's actions. At the time when Mr. Latcham made his donations, the citizens of the village had changed their views of what it meant to be a Stouffvillian. The residents no longer felt it was part of their responsibility to be involved in the provision of recreational facilities. Instead they turned to the government for this provision. For example, instead of working together to fix the floodlights, blame was put on the village council for not fixing them.

Mr. Latcham's actions also show why it is necessary for community spirit to foster actions which are shown through people working together to achieve a goal which better and/or internally promotes the whole locality. A lack of identification with the facilities he donated, in combination with
the charged nature of community spirit resulted, for example, in the village council having to financially assist the Lions Club to keep the swimming pool out of debt. Had the citizens instead worked together to acquire the swimming pool, just as they did with Stouffville Arena Limited, in all probability the same community spirit would have ensured the pool's continued debt-free operation.

Boosterism

The external aspect of community was provided by examining the concept of boosterism. The boosterism activities conducted in relation to Stouffville's recreational facilities, were directed at the nearby towns and villages and bragged to these localities about the quality of facilities which were available in Stouffville. In effect, these statements defended the status of the village, not only to Stouffville's neighbours, but also to the citizens of Stouffville. The claims made, reassured Stouffvillians that they were living in the right village. This defense orientation, instead of growth orientation which boosterism usually takes, was substantiated by the fact that Stouffville's population remained relatively stable over the entire time period examined.

Businessmen

Probably the most striking feature which appeared when considering all facilities together, was the central role Stouffville's businessmen played in the development, operation and maintenance of recreational facilit-
ies. From 1888 to 1971, these men influenced what was to be built, and acquired, operated, maintained, used and boasted about the facilities. The interests of the members of the business community determined if a facility would cease to exist when their leisure habits changed. Stouffville's businessmen were involved not only for economic reasons, but also and more importantly, because of the fact that they were residents of the village and were moved by the sense of community.

Before the turn of the century, businessmen provided for their own recreation. Although they had recognized a need for children's recreation, they did not provide them with a play area until after 1910. By 1919, a further expansion occurred as the need for active pastimes became a recognized component of the public park function. By this time, public recreation had expanded to include opportunities for everyone in the village. Soon thereafter, all sub-divisions of recreational facilities in Stouffville expanded and were provided for all villagers. Public structures and areas were essentially for children, private and semi-private facilities for adults, while commercial establishments were geared toward all of Stouffville's population.

When examining why members of the business community were involved in the provision of recreational facilities, several reasons can be cited. First, the businessmen had both the time and economic ability to become involved, as well as an interest in the potential economic gains. Profits from the facilities themselves, as well as increased property values are representative of these economic gains.

Secondly, the businessmen were involved for reasons of community. Living in the village and belonging to Stouffville meant a deeper association
than merely "business". There was a kinship which brought the businessmen together to share in something which could not be measured in economic terms. Statements about community were made in the Stouffville Tribune and undoubtedly affected all of Stouffville's citizens. A philosophy of sharing and of building Stouffville to be the best village in which to live, was frequently stated in the paper. These statements promoted a behavioural principle and attitude which was seen as desirable for living in Stouffville. The end result was that the business community adopted these ideas as guiding principles in their lives, and then participated to ensure fulfillment of their responsibilities.

Conclusions

The relationship which existed between recreational facilities and community in Stouffville from 1888 to 1971 was dynamic and complex. The citizens of the village were involved in the history of these facilities and in many situations were spurred on by reasons of community. This however, was not always the situation. At times, there was not a relationship between recreational facilities and community, while in other situations the presence and nature of the relationship shifted as it was affected by influences in society.

The dynamics of the relationship between recreational facilities and community were also shown by its unobtrusive nature. As has been shown in the documented histories of the facilities, the facilities were always present despite the fact that they were not always acknowledged. Their existence was for the most part unobtrusive in the everyday affairs of the
village. Similarly, the sense of community spirit and boosterism existed in the lives of Stouffvillians, but it was only when certain conditions emerged in recreational facilities, that community became obtrusive as well.

There were four conditions found that made the relationship between recreational facilities and community productive: when the quality of a facility was seen as being unacceptable; when citizen ownership of the facility was evident; when identification and pride in Stouffville was possible; and when the quality of the facility was very good and Stouffvillians wanted to defend the status of their village. When any of these conditions appeared, citizen involvement in the form of community was apparent.

Although this dynamic relationship existed between recreational facilities and community, this relationship does not account for all recreational structures and areas. There were many other influences which affected their histories. The major extraneous influence was the government. Not only did the government develop new areas and structures, but it also implemented legislation which affected maintenance and operation. Thus this factor in the theory of community must be remembered in future investigations of recreational facility development. Recognizing this fact, this study has nevertheless shown that community is a viable method of exploring facility development.

Although community was not consistently referred to in relation to recreational facilities, it was a method employed regularly in development, maintenance and operation of the facilities. During the years that Stouffville remained relatively stable, community remained stable as well. Conversely, from 1951 to 1971 when Stouffville underwent its relative growth,
a change in community was evident. This change was due to larger societal changes. Not only were leisure habits changing and being influenced by the automobile and television, but the undeniable influence of Toronto was being felt.

Stouffville like some of the neighbouring communities, is being drawn even closer into the Toronto orbit, an orbit which smothers all community identity. The events which are mentioned above as well as the clubs and organizations of the town are part of the community life which help to maintain the community's name, to advertise it, keep its niceness, that sets it apart from the big city. Little by little as things slip into disregard, as we become too busy to keep them going, we find ourselves swallowed up, by this great urban area ever growing around us.6

Lastly, this study has shown that community is an ever changing concept which is difficult to pinpoint. Although there were four conditions which were identified above as making the relationship productive, these conditions do not explain all occurrences of community in the history of Stouffville's recreational facilities. With these exceptions, community appeared as one of the philosophies which guided the lives and was part of the lives of Stouffvillians.

Men do not form a community ...merely in so far as the men cooperate. They form a community ...when they not only cooperate, but accompany this cooperation with that ideal extension of the lives of individuals whereby each cooperative member says: 'This activity which we perform together, this work of ours, its past, its future, its sequence, its order, its sense - all these enter into my life, and are the life of my own self writ large.'7

Recommendations

From this study, three recommendations for further research are
suggested.

First, it is recommended that the same relationship be examined in other villages and towns in southern Ontario, in aid of determining if the village of Stouffville was unique. Secondly, it is recommended that the same relationship be examined in urban areas in southern Ontario, in aid of determining any urban rural differences which might exist. Lastly, it is recommended that this study be replicated, but uses different sources of data, for example oral histories. In this manner the validity of the definitions created and used in the present study could be determined.
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