Random cross-country sample of opinions on film & video policy

Robert Lantos, RSL Entertainment Corp., Toronto:
"Overall, I feel it's a very positive step, long overdue and one which will strengthen the film industry and create an environment of stability which has not existed until now in Canada. The redefinition of the National Film Board role is equally overdue and reflects the reality of what the NFB should be. The board, which will stimulate growth of the film industry and create an environment of stability, is equally overdue and reflects the reality of what the NFB should be. Our area, only a small core staff was run by just about the same person since Andre Lamy was given his post by Pierre Trudeau, who's in the cabinet, and who controls him completely. It's really a 'gim- mick,' and I think it's deplorable that the producers don't understand things more clearly. Especially since the policy just buries the entire film industry, addresses itself to the television industry. It's completely idiotic. The Austra- lians have refused to sign a co-production treaty agreement with Canada, saying that the Canadian conception was existent to me.

"If I have to judge the policy on a scale from 1 to 10, it's zero. There's just nothing in it. No, there's $1 million for scripts, so I'll give it a one."

Tom Shandell, Jericho Films Ltd., Vancouver:
"You know for those of us on the Coast, or in the provincial enclaves like the Montreal English, who are, I imagine more or less in the same boat, I think this is regressive and it's a step in the right direction and it's a bigger step than I've ever seen before in my working lifetime which is about 13 years in this business. I must say that, regre- sively. One of the things I've said that superceded this in my view is the fact that he's out in the cold since Turner's been in. And this, I find shocking because I thought that the move for the kind of cultural components of this film business staying in the Department of Communication has actually been basically salutary for those of us in the independent industry.

"Fox understood in a tradi- tional liberal small 'I' liberal sense and big 'L' liberal sense in terms of the NFB are certain costs to independ- ent culture and that, regardless of what these costs are, there's certain thing that, of course, was the minimum threshold that we were prepared to stand for and fight on. So, it's nothing like a minimum number of Canadian films being produced yearly even if the argument could be made that they're self-sufficient. Or else we'd be absorbed in the American culture. And I would look at the policy with that kind of attitude that goes back to 1929 and the Aird Commission which really called for the establishment of the CBC for exactly the same reason that if we had left it to a kind of Tory thinking, we'd just be absorbed in the United States.

"Considering the NFB is a very important employer in our area, only a small core staff that hires exclusively free-lance, etc., and anything that disbands the Cote-de-Liesse facility and gets rid of the lab there and puts production centers in other regions, is, I think a very futu- ristic move. It even pleases the kind of right-wing, free-market types that exist out here. So, I think that getting away from the idea of a kind of institutionalization of Canada, of centralization which prevailed in the Film Board and still prevails in the CBC of course, the framework we get away from that, I would say that I support the attitude.

The fact that it's the deinsti- tutionalizing, kind of getting away from the somewhat monolithic structures - the staff kind of civil servants and bureaucrats and the other things - giving them some programs out to the private sector, that's a good sense. Those that want to make sponsored films constitute a certain part of the film industry. I think that's a number of priorities in the agenda that work here - I'm just looking for a middle ground that will help producers. And I see myself as part of the public sector of the film industry - that is, I can be non-com- mercial. From instinct and interest the kind of subjects I tend towards have to be sup- ported by government because no one else would. So, when I look from BC - we have a very reactionary government get out here - only the Federal govern- ment offers a the opportunity for some enlightenment now, but I think Fox was a very intel- ligent from what I can tell. A lot of the moves in the policy suggested means that he took a little distance and a kind of clarification of the Appleburst stuff which I thought was dis­ astrous and stupid-minded actually.

"I just think it's a move. I thought it was a move towards bringing the NFB back into the front rank of the public consciousness that we didn't need a backburner for a few years and somebody like Fox could articu- late those kinds of argu- ments. I had to rate the film policy from 1 to 10. I would give it, I think 6 or 7. But the issue whether the policy is 5.5 or 6.5 or 7.5 is because there's nothing there. As a citizen, there's nothing there. As a film producer, there's nothing there. As a politician, that's already dead since as far Turner's been in. So, if I had to give it a rating, I think it's a move, get what I think was a move towards.

Pierre René, France-Roger, Montreal:
"I haven't even read it so you see the kind of importance it has in my eyes. All I know is that my arguments were a success - the fact that, from what my colleagues have told me it does absolutely nothing for the independent film industry. And that's about it. Even if some have said that it kills the sector, I can't see how you can kill something by not doing anything as far as I know distribution in English Canada is almost dead.

"Anyway, for the moment, the policy doesn't affect me. It might have if the federal govern- ment had taken the decision to revitalize the indepen- dent film industry and it's obvious that it wasn't going to do anything. Finally, it's been three years since Fox has done nothing and he's just going to talk about it that he even talks about it, but only one can only conclude that it's a policy that wasn't worth touching. I've always found that strange because there is a distribution problem at here problem at the governmental level, let's not kid ourselves. Cinema is after all not a major industry in Canada. Whether there is a Canadian cinema or not is not going to change the face of the Canadian economy even if you put all the film industry together from exhibition to production, it does not repre- sent an enormous activity. And distribution is a tiny fraction of this, of course. But it's not a small number of people that are simply not prepared to undertake a great battle to save that sector. Or so it seems to me. And I don't know if it has been said in the past 30-40 years, nothing ever does happen after it's just not worth it.

"So things'll go on pretty much as they've been. I don't really know what the great diffi- culty is since Fox is after all not the first minister to have ever tackled this dossier. But for all sorts of reasons it's the Ottawa politicians, but when you look at it in practice two years later, nothing comes of it - distribution, nothing, exhibi- tion, nothing.

"If I look at the policy as a distributor, I'd give it a 1 - there's nothing there. As a citi- zen, I'd give it a 5 or 4.5 but then, as I said, I haven't read it."
Random opinions
(cont. from p. 37)

...it's much too diffuse.

Since the government introduced the Broadcast Fund last July, its policy should be based on that concept. The thing to do is to push Canadian production in the direction in which it can be of some impact. The policy doesn't zero in on anything, and I don't think that that provides much leadership or excitement or whatever.

"Although the policy seems to reject the [Film Board] recommendation of the Applebaum-Hebert Commission, it doesn't really suggest any other policy. It defines no role for the Film Board. It simply says that the Board should be given five years to devise a policy for itself.

When you come to the distribution thing, I think it's a pity that they didn't follow up on the Broadcast Policy. At least there they had some direction, they said, 'Look. The future for the film industry in Canada is to produce for television because television is something we can control to some extent ourselves.' At least there is a policy...

They could have put a lot more stress on the question of video-cassettes, for example. Video movies in video stores and all that. They could have said, 'That's an important area. We will come up with some special programs to assist Canadian producers to get their stuff marketed.' But they seem to be trying in every area, except in the case of theatrical distribution. There it appears that the main thrust of their idea is to tell Canadian producers, 'Try and get into Canada via the U.S. I think they should be honest with Canadian distributors and say, 'Look, you guys, your business is going down the tube. Why should we put any money into it?' But they didn't say that. On the one hand, they say, 'let's get Americans to distribute more Canadian films in Canada, and then they have these programs of support for marketing of Canadian productions but it remains to be seen what they're going to be doing to assist Americans.'

"This inequity with the U.S. Majors for more Canadian films in theatres is all being presented to us as if it has never happened before. But, in fact, attempts have been made by various ministers to negotiate this kind of a deal, to my knowledge. In 1983, in 1972, probably in 1977. None of it has ever worked because the government of Canada has never taken a solid position up-front with legislation in place that they can use to convince the other side that they are really serious. And I don't have any hope that this will be any better than any of the other efforts.

"So on a scale from 1-10, I'd be tempted to give the policy a 5, but that sounds like I have no opinion. So I'll give it a 4."

George Christofi,
Filmwest, Edmonton:
"We were hurt a great two years ago when the tax shelter was removed and people no longer had an investment incentive. Until then, we were doing quite well. There is nothing in the most recent policy which repairs the damage which has been done.

"This inequity with the U.S. Majors has never been presented to us as if it has never happened before. But, in fact, attempts have been made by various ministers to negotiate this kind of a deal, to my knowledge. In 1983, in 1972, probably in 1977. None of it has ever worked because the government of Canada has never taken a solid position up-front with legislation in place that they can use to convince the other side that they are really serious. And I don't have any hope that this will be any better than any of the other efforts."

Peter Simpson, Simcom Ltd., Toronto:
"I guess my impression is generally favorable. It seems to draw all the areas together. From wanting the events over the years, there wasn't a single policy before. Now what they've done is amalgamated all the various policies into one cohesive body. I don't think they've necessarily fit that well together. It wasn't really thought out as one policy; it's simply an amalgamation.

"The policy is weak in its attempt at marketing, in the distribution of Canadian film... Having some chats with the majors just doesn't work. Fundamentally, the majors are looking making sure they have access to the screens in this country is another, and I don't think they've really been realistic about insuring that is going to happen.

"The fund is a good idea. There's no specific help for features. Pointing out the continued existence of the capital cost allowance is a bit of a joke because you couldn't get arrested selling cca's these days. It's nice that it's there, but having it on the statutes and having it function is a different thing. There will be positive aspects. For the first time they have acknowledged the distribution and marketing phase. They have acknowledged that there is help needed in that area.

"I hope, through some experimentation by Canadian distributors on Canadian films with the co-production treaty to show the worths and perhaps lead to a more comprehensive policy which will be more realistic about getting the job done."

Andy Emilio, Citadel Distribution, Toronto:
"I think the policy is irrelevant to distribution. It is going to affect the way in which whatever Canadian production is done here on in. It puts the control which people like myself had – the entrepreneurs – into the hands of the government and Telefilm Canada. Canadian distributors used to be involved, because we knew the marketplace from the ground up – better than the producer at certain given times. Now the Majors are to handle the films, not only in the States but in Canada. Aside from putting us down in our own country, we don't have a chance to extend outside of the country either.

"The film policy wasn't worth waiting for. It doesn't solve any problems. It will affect the industry adversely. The Canadian part of the film industry up here is still a small part of the whole. Most of the films, that's the U.S. people who can make. Taking all facets of the industry – producers, directors, actors, writers, distributors – the policy is still going to lead the good Canadian people out of Canada because the American's going to cultivate people up here by offering them down. It's not going to prove the industry in any way."

Allen Stein,
Filmwest, Edmonton:
"I think almost everybody in the private film industry applauds the spirit of the film policy, and I join with them. But there are quite a few things which alarm me about it. The main thing is that – I don't want to bring it back – if we lost to East thing, or the Hinterland against the Metropolis – but those of us who are outside of the standard east group, we're at a disadvantage no matter how open and warm and sensitive the people in the central institutions are to us, because of the centralization of these very institutions. Just to make the phone calls and the trips to Toronto, we're at a huge financial disadvantage because that's an expensive and time-consuming proposition. And we're not part of the gossip mill and the socializing that goes on in Toronto so, just for starters, we're at a disadvantage and the film policy does not address that issue all. The word 'regional' only crops up once in the film policy, and only with reference to the Film Board part of the policy. So what scares me is that there are no directives in the policy to govern the basic principles by which Telefilm will operate via a view regional parity and regional development. In fact, its developmental role is very subject to question because Telefilm, in the past, has shown itself to be more interested in the Hollywood orientation. The problem is that a few people do something a little bit scary. With all its money, Telefilm doesn't seem to be very oriented toward the first-time producer, or the producer who is outside of the standard clique.

"Most people are pretty sensitive about the distribution part. It seems to me that the problem is so much more fundamental than just quotes or voluntary quotas or whatever they try to do. It's a whole cultural thing, and it's so deep and it's so broad that it's hard to attack this problem without trying to kindle the whole national imagination, which is really what it's all about... It..."
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can’t hurt but it follows the Hollywood model, and Telefilm’s into that. There isn’t a word about Australia, or about an industry which can grow up with a cultural identity as well as being viable financially and artistically.”

André Link,
Cinepix, Montreal
“Generally, I think it’s a step in the right direction, with one extremely disturbing factor which concerns distribution. I think that, in so far as distribution is concerned, the policy is short-sighted, erroneous, ignorant and devastating. It should be changed. As it stands, it’s an absolute negation of what has been said and done for the past ten years and more. You still have to show me a country in which there is indigenous production without national distributors. If Canada is to be the new model, well, I’d like to see that.”

Jack Darcus, Exile Film Productions, Vancouver:
“I’m impressed with what they are talking about. The main problem is the elections. I’m worried about the removal of Francis Fox and I’m not sure that was the best thing to do in the middle of the process. The election is going to matter very much for the filmmakers because the implementation of the policy is, I expect, going to be questionable.

“The most promising part of the policy is that something is going to be done about distribution of Canadian films in Canadian theatres. The surface thrust is that a lot of money is going to be distributed to people in the industry but behind it is the idea of a fair system in Canada for Canadian films and Canadian theatres. All the details of the thing sound very positive.

“1 think that what’s happened in the past is that a ‘good will’ system has been put into place. And that was eroded and never brought into practice. My understanding, from the film policy meetings we’ve had out here, is that they will explore ways to bring pressure upon the Americans to do something about this. I’m not interested in good will myself because I just don’t believe it works, but after a six-month period of evaluation, they will talk about such things as tax levies, quotas and all that. I think the idea that the Americans will somehow make more Canadian films in America might add up to a little more than tokenism. The problem to be addressed is that all the money leaves the country every year without any of it resting here, doing what it should for us as it does in other countries.”

Jim Westwell, Televestra Film Development Inc.,
Vancouver:
“We don’t have a particular need right now to read it but I guess that just it doesn’t affect me immediately at this moment. I guess that’s why I haven’t bothered to pick up and run with it. But inevitably it certainly will affect me down the line and bow, I don’t know yet before I read it. But no, I’ve been working on a Hollywood picture and it’s going on and on and that just keeps me busy.”

Victor Loewy,
Vivafilms, Montreal:
“There’s not a single word of new facts, new suggestions, new ideas. They are simply rehashing the same paper I’ve seen for the last six years. Basically, what I see is that they have hired more people and they came up with the same policies. They watered down everything vis a vis the Majors they left the field totally open to them, and we’re extremely unhappy with them.

“I’m falling back to my old position. I don’t give a shit one way or the other what the government does because they’re not helping us. I’m going to suggest to my organization (of distributors) that we shouldn’t stop operating with them in any way and treat them as if they don’t exist. They have never, never done anything we told them to do. We submitted a very specific paper about pay TV which they have never received. We have submitted suggestions for the video policy. It hasn’t been followed, and everything is, once again, controlled by the Majors.

“I was totally and completely surprised by the policy. I would never believe that Francis Fox would sell out to such an extent. It’s a joke. What are their conclusions? I’ve seen that they are going to go to the Majors to beg them to agree to take money from Telefilm to launch Canadian films. That’s all. Basically, I thought that the policy was going to give Telefilm Canada something to do. Before, 80% of the money given to them was used up to pay the salary. Now they’re just hiring more incompetent people. But what are they doing? I’ve asked Lamy now for years. I want to know what they’re doing, what they’ve done since Lamy took over. I never had any beef before, but since Lamy took over, there’s been nothing. I’m deeply dissapointed, so much so that in my case it’s going to influence the way I’m going to vote.”

Allocations by the Société

MONTREAL – Since the Société générale du cinéma became Quebec’s principal film-financing agency Feb. 20, it has allocated over $2 million of public money to 75 private-sector projects.

Figures released July 17 report an allocation of $2,365,144 to 75 projects between Feb. 20 and July 13, 1984. Thirty two projects ($322,323) fall under the development category; 16 projects ($1,665,200) were allocated to 7 projects ($73,996) in the category of distribution; 17 special projects ($269,364) and three projects ($43,260) in the marketing category.

Since the 1984-1985 aid plan (approximately $8 million) went into effect June 1, the SGC had by July 9 received applications for a total of 109 projects with budgets totalling $40 million, of which the SGC was being requested to invest $7 million.

The state has allocated $10 million towards cinema this year,” SGC CEO Nicole M. Buis-vert told Cinema Canada. “Just think of what we could do with $25 million a year!”

The Fournier Report, which recommended the creation of the new SGC, also recommended an annual film-financing budget of $25 million.

CINE MAG