Habitual Hit-Maker

by Peter Haynes

Nowadays, I think the way to make money is to produce good films! But, of course, we don't know what a good film is.

This fact notwithstanding, Roger Frappier's career has been quite remarkable. He has produced or coproduced four of the best Canadian films of the past two years, and two of the best Canadian films ever. Anne Trister, Pouvoir intime, Le Déclin de l'empire américain, and Un zoo, la nuit are stylish, intelligent, and frequently whimsical films, well-acted and well-directed. Each was made for a budget of less than $2 million and they have all done well financially.

"It's intuition really, but, at the same time, it's knowledge and experience. In large measure, that experience comes from watching films. I saw a lot of movies from a very early age because my aunt worked at Théâtre Sorel. When I was a student in Montreal, I saw three films a day for three or four years. I worked as a projectionist; I worked as a film critic. Even now, I still see as many movies as I can, especially films related to what I'm working on. In the end, though, after all the discussion, if you feel right about the film, that's all you have to go on."

Roger Frappier is an extremely charming, agreeable man in his early 40s. He is also, as he says, "a man of habit", and one of his habits is to eat breakfast at L'Express, a pleasant restaurant-bar situated on rue St-Denis in Montreal. We're surrounded by mirrors and chrome and maroon paint as we chat about the course of his career.

In June 1984, after a previous stint some years earlier as a producer, he returned to the National Film Board as executive producer and head of programs for Studio C. But he agreed to come back only on certain conditions.

"I was not interested in producing the way I had produced before. I wanted to make low-budget, contemporary movies dealing with our problems, with our lives. A lot of things were happening to us that we never saw on the screen, so, since writing is the most difficult and important part of filmmaking, I wanted to put together a group of filmmakers to develop these kinds of themes. But for this to be worth anything, I needed a financial commitment from the Board to produce the films developed in the group. I got that commitment and I put together Le groupe de travail cinématographique comprised of Lea Pool, Jacques Leduc, Denys Arcand, Bernad Gosselin, Tahani Rached, and Pierre Falardeau."

"We worked collectively. Once some one had written something, he or she gave the text to the rest of the group. They read it, made notes, then we had a meeting. Everyone had their say, one after the other, and no one was allowed to interrupt the person who was talking. When he or she was through, the writer had to answer to the notes. The process worked very, very well and, slowly, the scripts were developed."

The process did indeed work well because out of it came the scripts for Anne Trister and Le Déclin de l'empire américain. Such strict attention to the development stage of the script has another advantage for the producer. It means that, by the time he comes to pr...
I know what is essential to the movie and what is not because I don't take a script two weeks before pre-production. So when there's a problem, I can go to the director and say that we have to cut this or we have to cut that. Of course, at first, they think I'm a bastard like the rest of them, but the next day we talk it over and it always works out.

I can give you a specific example. On Anne Trister, Léa Pool wanted to shoot on a train in Switzerland. But when we found out that it would take three days to film the sequence in the train and we'd only have the use of it from 11:00 at night to 3:00 in the morning, we said, 'Why don't you shoot the scene at an airport? She can be in a plane instead of a train.

'It was a question of what was really important. Take the painting sequences in Anne Trister. We never did anything to compromise those because they were so important to say. They had to be there. Once you fully understand the vision of the director and the screenwriter, then it's only day-by-day. It's hard, but it's day-by-day.'

He tries to reduce the difficulties, the uncertainties and the burdens of production by co-producing with people he trusts. Claude Bonin on Anne Trister and Pouvoir Intime, Réve Valois on Le Déclin, and now Pierre Gendron with whom he formed Les Productions OZ, now become Cinémà Plus Production Inc. But even with a partner to talk things over with, sticking to your belief in a film which has come in for some serious international criticism is still very difficult and very harrowing. Le Déclin was screened in Paris as part of the selection process for the Cannes Film Festival. The screenings were a disaster.

'They were awful. People didn't laugh or, if they did, it was at the wrong places. Everything went badly. I could see all the mistakes in the film. I was completely shaken. Afterwards, Pierre Gendron and I were walking along one of the most beautiful streets in the world, the Champs Elysées, completely oblivious to our surroundings, utterly depressed, asking ourselves, 'Could we have been so wrong?' We'd liked the film when we saw it in Montreal, we'd laughed a lot, we thought it was really good. So we had a meeting with everybody concerned and decided that the film would stay as it was, for better or for worse. Then, after all of that, the film was selected enthusiastically to open the Directors' Fortnight, and the rest is history.

'Same thing happened this year with Zoo, la nuit. Pierre and I arrived at Cannes with our hearts in our shoes. The film had been screened earlier and they didn't like it, they didn't take it seriously, they didn't laugh. But on this occasion, Pierre Gendron and I said, 'No, we're not wrong this time.' But, Jesus, it's tough; it's really, really tough. It showed me again that when you're making a film you're telling a story the way you think it should be told. You have to stick to that and fight for what you think is right.

'You really need good help throughout, and the most important help comes from the director. It's the director that takes you where you want to go. There's no way to work with different directors because they each have their own world. You have to understand that world, you have to get into it, and you have to work with it till it is realized. So a very important part of the director's work is to make sure what the director has in his imagination is visualized. It is the director of photography, Guy Dufaux, and some other people. It was an important decision to make, and the right one.

'We had problems on this film like you wouldn't believe. Take the pool-room/snackbar set, Jean-Claude Lauzon, the director, said I don't know how many snack bars, but he was never satisfied. And then suddenly shooting was three days away and we still didn't have a location. There was one place that Pierre and I liked and so, with two days left, we said, 'We're very sorry, but that's where we're going to shoot.'

'There was a space at the back where we were going to store the equipment. We arrived on the day of the shoot and there it was: the space we'd been looking for for weeks and hadn't found. It was two in the afternoon and the place was bare. Four hours later it was completely dressed with pool tables, restaurant equipment, lamps, and so on, and we were shooting in an amazing location we couldn't have dreamed of the day before. That's what, when the crew is together, you can do almost instantly.

'There are times, when a film is going well, that the feeling is almost magical. It's 5:00 in the morning in the middle of nowhere, raining a little; there are trucks in the fields, the crew is taking its lunch break, eating and chatting, and the rest of the world is asleep. You look around and you really feel like you're in touch with something unique, and it's beautiful. But you can be there at 5:00 in the morning wondering, 'Why am I here? This is awful. What am I doing this for a living?' It's simply a matter of whether or not the crew is working together and the movie is going well.

'What this all boils down to is that the producer's most important responsibility is to the film itself. You have to ask, 'Is this what's best for the movie? How can we do it? Do we have time to do it?' And one way is to be there from the beginning to the end. I think that's
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very important, it's the way it should be done.

"And this can be exhausting, especially during production itself. It's very tough on the family. Un Zoo, la nuit was particularly difficult. When you're working for 14 weeks, seven days a week, 18 hours a day, you don't see anybody at home and when you do, you have to get used to them. Your mind is always on the film. There was a time on Zoo when it was as though the movie had taken over my life. It was uncanny.

"A pipe burst and flooded the house, so we had to open up the wall and repair it. There was so much dust we put our bird upstairs. And one morning, with the hole in the wall and all that plaster, I was coming down the stairs with the bird in my hand and I saw Albert with his bird in his hand in his wreck of an apartment. I sat down on the stairs, my house was a shambles, I had a real bird in my hand, and I thought, 'This is absurd. It gives a whole new meaning to bringing your work home!'"

"I think it will always be like this. My wife and I have been married for the last 11 years and we have two kids. So, in that time, we've been through a lot of films together. You don't get used to it, but you know it'll be O.K. afterwards. It's tough on the family though, there's no doubt about that.

Anne Trister, developed at the National Film Board during the groupe de travail cinématographique days, was the first of the four films to go into production. Frappier had production money guaranteed from the Board, but not enough in his estimation to do the film justice. He had lunch with Claude Bonin of Vision Quatre.

"Claude had developed Pouvoir in­time, written by Yves Simoneau and Pierre Curzi, and I had Anne Trister. Claude had the same problems on Pouvoir in­time as I did: he needed exactly money to do it properly. We realised that if we pooled our resources and put everybody together, La Société Générale, Telefilm and the National Film Board, we could do what we wanted. And that's how the National Film Board and the private sector started co-producing. It was as simple as that.

Pouvoir in­time ended up with a budget of $1.7 million and Anne Trister was $4.4 million. If I remember correctly, the National Film Board put up something like $250,000 for Pouvoir in­time, the rest having been raised by Claude from the other agencies, and for Anne Trister the Board's share was something like $800,000 and Claude got the remainder from the Société and Telefilm. The differences in the levels of financing simply reflected the fact that the Board had developed the one project and Claude had developed the other. So putting the two together provided the missing link and it worked per­fectly.

"The budget for Le Déc­lin, the second film developed by Le groupe, was $1.8 million. We did it for $1.7. In fact, in the case of all three films, it was the
first time, I think, in the history of the Board, that films came in on or under budget! We used the same basic financing structure. I took the script to René Malo who read it and really liked it. He got his money from the Société Générale, Radio-Canada and Telefilm, and four days later we were in pre-production.

At the end of Le Déclin, things got a little difficult at the Board. Pierre Gendron had been the line producer on that film and we had gotten along very well, so it was natural for me to quit and go and work with him. Pierre already had Un Zoo as a project. So when we got together, the first film that we wanted to do. We applied exactly the same group technique on the script as I had employed before. Denys Arcand and Lea Pool joined us and we all discussed every scene and then, after a lot of planning, we went into production. It was the first feature I produced which was financed in part by private investors. Its total budget was $1.9 million and of that $350,000 came from non-governmental sources.

All of these films have done very well. Le Déclin, apart from its critical success, has made a lot of money. Un Zoo, given its current box-office showing, will probably go into a profit position some time in the future. Anne Trister did not recoup but it did well. It played in Montreal for 27 weeks in a row—very good run—and, after its success at Berlin, it sold in Germany and France and elsewhere. Remember, Léa is making very personal films, for which she has to build an audience. When you think of her, you must think over the long haul.

Pouvoir Intime played 22 weeks in Montreal. It hasn’t recouped completely, but some will, some won’t.

After we finished Un Zoo, we were completely exhausted. We took the summer off, reorganized the company, and now we’re ready to start again. We’re preparing to shoot three films next year. The first will be the new Denys Arcand film. The script will be finished in December, and it will be a continuation of his previous work.

Then we have two projects that are completely different from anything we’ve done before. One is called La rue vers Part written by Claude Meunier and Serge Theriault—Ding et Dong—a duo of very popular stand-up comics in Quebec. We have two drafts of the script and now we’re looking for a director. When we pick one, he will work with them on the final script.

The other project is a musical written by Luc Plamondon and Pierre Gen­eral­. We really wanted to do a musical, and we’ve been talking to Luc for the last eight months. He has a very good story, a kind of filmic opera, which is like to me the new West Side Story. It’s very urban, very contemporary, and related to events that happened here. It’s really beautiful.

So we have these three features for next year, which we intend to produce back-to-back with the same crew. Costs have increased, partly because of the amount of American production in the province, so, although these will all be low-budget films compared to American standards, I fear the average cost is likely to be between $2.5 and $5.0 million apiece.

If I had talked to you a month ago, I would have said that these films would have been financed in the usual way. Now, of course, I can’t do that. La Société has been absorbed by the SOGIC and we don’t know how that’s going to work. Telefilm is in a dreadful mess and may only have about $70 million for disbursement next year: about half of what it should have. And it looks like we’ve lost the already emasculated capital cost allowance for private investors. So, I don’t know what we’re going to do. What amazes me is the unerring ability of both provincial and federal governments to spot those programs that are working well, move in on them, and kill them. They’re dedicated to assuring that we don’t succeed.

Radio-Canada doesn’t help, either. They are not living up to their responsibilities. You should keep in mind that if one produces two films for the same budget, one in Toronto and one in Montreal, then the CBC will put in $300,000 to $400,000, and Radio-Canada only $80,000 to 100,000. It is already difficult enough to produce viable in France because the market is so much smaller than the English market, without having to put up with this level of funding.

“I think it’s a disgrace. I think that Radio-Canada should be obliged to put aside $5 million a year for French production in Quebec and they should earmark between $500,000-$400,000 on a production. Radio-Canada has a billion-dollar-a-year budget, there is absolutely no reason why it shouldn’t do this for Quebec cinema. How else are we going to keep up the quality of production?”

“Still, I’m very happy doing what I’m doing, even if it’s really tough. Directing, although I didn’t realise it at the time, was a step on the road to production, and I’ve been able to use everything I learned. I don’t think, at the moment, that I’d like to return to the goings-on of writing and directing. I’ve just started in production and I haven’t come close to finishing what I started out to do.

“Besides it’s fascinating. You go from literature to financing to negotiating to dealing with Tilden rent-a-car. There are so many different levels of activity and each one opens up a new universe. But, at the same time, you are particularly disengaged. When I was a director I always felt the need to solve all the creative problems but it’s for somebody else. If I can’t find a solution, I can still sleep. The director has to solve it.

“When the movie’s finished, I know it’s not as much mine as it is the director’s, but I’m fulfilled. And when you feel fulfilled, you’re happy in life. If you’re happy in life, you like what you’re doing. If you like what you’re doing, you’ll be good at what you’re doing. It’s as simple as that.”