

Fistful of errors

We appreciate very much the article on First Choice in the November/December 1982 issue of Cine Mag. However, there are a number of errors which we would like to correct:

- My name is Joan Schafer and I am Vice-President, Director/Programming.
- The \$600,000 mentioned was for a 90-minute production, not a one-hour production.
- His Majesty's Yankees is a \$6 million mini-series being developed by Peter Waldman.
- Romance was directed by Jack McAndrew.
- Wild Pony is being co-produced by Derek McGillivray and Eda Lishman.
- Fast Lane is produced by Simcom.
- Two features by John Trent are in development.
- Quebec-Canada is in development.
- Right Moves is produced by Michael Leibowitz.

Please understand that some of these projects are in development and have not yet been licensed. Therefore, we would appreciate these corrections appearing in the next issue of Cine Mag.

We would be glad to participate in any future articles on First Choice that your magazine wishes to publish.

Joan Schafer
Vice-President
Director/Programming

Flawed festival

Further to your mention, in the last number of Cinema Canada, of the 14th Canadian Student Film Festival, we wish to take this opportunity to underline some of the inadequacies and flaws of this festival, which might otherwise be an exciting gallery for new Canadian filmmakers.

It is our feeling that the entire festival operation must be re-evaluated and reassessed, for at the moment the festival brinks on illusion and fallacy. There are several problems which we will discuss, and if Mr. Serge Losique (theoretically, the director and founder of the whole operation) wants to consider these points he might respond in kind through this forum.

Opening night of the festival was marked by the introductory remarks of Mr. Losique, who welcomed the audience, stating "Hi kids - here we are again!" This bit of conviviality is revealing for many reasons, the most obvious of which is a certain disdain for the event.

If these remarks were unthinking, the organization of the festival was deleterious, and this lack of responsibility and concern must rest with the coordinator of the event, Daniele Couchard, who ordinarily is the director of programming for the Conservatoire cinématographique d'art (which utilizes the facilities at Concordia University). The bad organization ranged from a lack of publicity to a restrictive admission price. With a budget of \$10,000, did this 'modest' festival (to use the qualifier Couchard uses) need to be so sheltered? With all the connections the Losique office has (given the grandiose nature of the Montreal Film Festival), could the event not have been assured mass-media coverage? Could the commercial sources, distribution representatives, the Festivals

Bureau, the CBC, the CFDC, and other industry members, not have been urged to attend?

It seems in past years attendance at the festival has been declining. This year, perhaps because of the \$2.00 admission, many more people stayed away. It's nice to be with friends watching their films but that's not the point of the event. The festival could be treated as a 'career day' for filmmakers, just as engineers and computer scientists have their 'days'. The Canadian Student Film Festival could help to de-mystify the film industry, and it would enable students and industry to meet and deal as equals.

A more debatable point concerns the pre-selection committee: when a film is refused by the pre-selection committee, the committee should give reasons for this decision. Student filmmakers should understand why their films have been refused. Why institute a student film festival, if no learning takes place?

What is called the unexpected bonus of the festival is also the biggest candy: the winning films are screened in the Directors' Fortnight section at the Cannes Film Festival. Last year's nine winners were at Cannes, but what was the outcome of this opportunity? Why was there no feedback on this? And why not aid these filmmakers to enter their films directly in competition, in the Cannes Student Film Festival, the Montreal Film Festival, or any other film festival for which these films are eligible.

Student films deserve to be seen, and fundamentally, a festival such as the Canadian Student Film Festival, should support the filmmakers' access beyond the festival itself.

Finally, the film which won the grand prize - \$10,000 Norman McLaren Award (donated by the NFB) - should be shown in its entirety on awards night. *Scissere*, by Peter Mettler, a graduate of Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, won the prize this year. At 90 minutes, it was the festival's longest film, but also its most ambitious and brilliant. The screening of a five-minute clip from the film is totally abysmal and disrespectful to the filmmaker.

Word of mouth on this year's festival will spread, to be sure, and as certainly student filmmakers will enter next year's festival. We ask, where will the Canadian Student Film Festival go from here?

Philip Szporer & Yolande Garant,
Montreal

Film Canada confusion

I have read your No. 90-91 with great interest. Your 62 pages provide a lot of splendid material. Your Editorial gives a down-to-earth analysis which can be most helpful in these times of readjustment. Congratulations!

However, I would like to comment on the statement: "It (Applebaum-Hébert) suggests the use of Film Canada when no such organization really exists and the private sector has been vociferous and unanimous in suggesting the idea be buried."

That statement refers only to the umbrella concept launched in Canada in early 1982 for participation in selected film markets. It should not be applied to Film Canada Center, the Beverly Hills office set up in mid-1981 to help in production development, marketing support, location filming in Canada, liaison

service, analysis and communications.

The Center's ongoing services have been used and endorsed by a large cross-section of the Canadian film milieu for over a year. Therefore, I hope you and your readers are not confusing Film Canada Center with Film Canada, as mentioned in your editorial.

Roland Ladouceur
Executive Director
Film Canada Center

Invisible women

I have been asked to write to you on behalf of the ACTRA Women's Caucus concerning your September issue No. 88 and the article by Paul Kelman, "Boom! The Actor's Point of View".

Judging from the cover photo and the article itself, one would be forced to assume that there are no women acting in features at all. While our own research indicates the appalling lack of opportunity for women writers and performers in films, fortunately they are not as invisible as your magazine would suggest. What was perhaps even more insulting to the many accomplished women performers in Canada was your magazine's failure to credit the few women who were pictured in the photos accompanying the article.

Regrettably, this is not the first time Cinema Canada has presented a poor or demeaning image of women. Nor is it the first time the matter has been brought to your attention.

Your magazine has published many excellent articles on film in Canada, including a number of articles specifically dealing with the women who work in the industry.

We at ACTRA would like to think that Cinema Canada is on our side in our efforts to equalize work opportunities for women and men. A well-respected trade magazine such as your could be a valuable asset to achieving that goal. At the very least, we feel we can expect that our work will not be undermined with articles such as the one above.

Nanci Rossov
ACTRA Women's Caucus

The subject of the article mentioned was the "actor's point of view", and not the "performing artist's point of view" nor the "actor's/actress's point of view". When we printed an article about women technicians, we didn't get letters from the men in the crews who had been omitted. As for the cover, it simply showed the principal men who were interviewed in the article. Instead of writing letters, perhaps you could convince a woman writer from ACTRA to address herself to the problem and submit an article. We would welcome it. Ed.

Jet-set tedium

I am enclosing my subscription renewal form and check with this letter to you to add a little substance to what is otherwise a pretty negative letter.

My reaction to seeing Cinema Canada show up in the mail at home - this is a personal subscription I maintain for my own benefit - has ranged over the past year from a high of professional interest to a current low of personal boredom.

Maybe I'm not the only subscriber you

have who doesn't give a damn if he never reads another word about the infinitely involved, infinitely corrupt and infinitely tedious writhing of Canadian cinema's jet set and its never-ending quest to get everything arranged so that they can make incredible amounts of money without ever making a film worth seeing. By anyone, Canadian, American or Australian.

If I'm not, perhaps Cinema Canada could try to make a few changes. My interest would be revived by more and better technical writing: not manufacturers' press releases. I liked Bob Rouvroy's column and I feel bitter that it never appeared again after an angry letter from a manufacturer denouncing Bob ran in your letters column.

I'd also like to see some attention paid to the parts of Canada's film industry that aren't always looking for a tit to suck in Ottawa.

In short, I don't like the way you're doing your job. It's your magazine, it's my \$18.00. I certainly don't expect a magazine edited for me and only me; but I can't help thinking I'm not the only one who wants more from Cinema Canada.

Dave Sands
Edmonton

Racist slur?

Concerning the review by Andrew Dowler in shorts (Oct. issue 89) of Falardeau and Poulin's *Elvis Gratton*.

I protest the racist slur against the Québécois so blatant in the last paragraphs. To insult the character of the Québécois so glibly without being admonished by you [the editors] makes me ashamed of your magazine's apathy. This flaw is beneath your standards. You owe an apology and a promise of future vigilance!

You have my permission to print this complaint. I am not alone in feeling hurt by Dowler's smug insult.

Charles Chénier
Montreal
Documentary filmmaker

Obviously, the object of satire is to touch a nerve, to strike a chord of recognition in the spectator. Elvis Gratton accomplished this, as was duly reported. The remarks made by Dowler were not, and are not now, considered by the editors to be a "racist slur" against the Québécois. Ed.

ERRATA: Our thanks to photographer Chris Gosso whose shot of Jack Chambers was used for the cover of our last issue (nos. 90/91). Also, our apologies to Claude Gagnon and the actors of *Larose, Pierrot et la Luce*, whose credits were reversed. Richard Niquette played Jacques Larose while Luc Matte gave the "veritable star-turn" as Pierrot. Also, in the news item on the Yorkton festival, director Alex Hamilton-Brown, who made *Life Another Way*, was erroneously referred to simply as Alex Hamilton. Finally, Petra Valier was responsible for the translation of Francine Prévost's article "The disturbing dialectic of Anne Claire Poirier." Ed.