Creating a Context:  
An Interview with Clarke Mackey

by Wyndham Paul Wise

Clarke Mackey was something of a precocious child. In 1966, at the ripe young age of 16, he produced, directed, shot and edited his first 20-minute, 16mm short. Not only did he manage to sell it to the CBC, but he actually made his money back. For an independent filmmaker of any age in Canada, this was a remarkable accomplishment.

Mackey's ambition was to produce and direct his first feature by the time he reached 20. This he did with The Only Thing You Know. His leading lady, the unknown and untrained Ann Knox, won the Best Actress award at the 1971 Canadian Film Awards and the awards jury created a special category for The Only Thing You Know. Mackey won for an "outstanding achievement on a first feature film."

In the authoritative Film Companion, Peter Morris describes The Only Thing You Know as a "singular and authentic vision of the life of young, middle-class Torontonians in the early '70s." The film drew great reviews, but very little else. Its total lack of distribution, or 'context' as Mackey would now say, dampened the young filmmaker's enthusiasm for making a living in the business. As a self-financed, truly independent film (only $4,000 of the $22,000 budget came from the Canadian Film Development Corp.), The Only Thing You Know fell into the great void that was distribution in the Canadian film industry in 1971.

I remember having the opportunity to meet Mackey in 1972 at Gerald Pratley's Stratford Film Festival. Here was an angry, long-haired, bearded young man who had just witnessed his childhood dream turn sour. The sheer native determination that drove Mackey to create a small gem of a film proved to be the fuel for his bitter denouncement of the commercial nature of the beast. His dream had become a canned product without distribution.

1971 was the year of The Rowdyman and La Vraie nature de Bernadette. In those days, Toronto excepted, more than two or three Canadian films receiving theatrical distribution in a year was almost unheard of anywhere in the English-speaking market. While Mackey didn't quite turn his back on filmmaking — he remained involved on the fringes for several years, freelancing and teaching — things bad changed for this ambitious young man from Oshawa.

After an unsatisfying experience making A Right To Live, the controversial documentary made for the union of injured workers in 1977, Mackey decided to quit trying to earn a living in film. He turned instead to a long standing interest in early childhood education, creating a context for non-professionals to work in the arts. For almost six years Mackey devoted himself to the artistic needs of pre-school children. Becoming totally involved in his new career, he eventually opened his own nursery in a working-class part of Toronto. This involvement, ironically, led him back into feature filmmaking.

In 1984 TVOntario offered him the opportunity to make a documentary about the crisis in daycare. The timing and the unique combination of Mackey's dual careers proved to be pivotal. Despite initial hesitation, he responded to the challenge like a duck to water. The documentary, All Day Long, led to a short drama in 1985, Pulling Flowers, which, in turn, led to a feature-length production, all wholly, or partially, financed by TVOntario. With the blessing and guidance of Babs Church, TVO's producer on all three of the projects, Mackey returned to the personal, co-operative style of filmmaking he prefers. His earnest sincerity and commitment to a spontaneous way of working is still very much in evidence.

The maturity and complexity of emotional range found in Taking Care far exceeds anything that Mackey achieved in The Only Thing You Know. Nevertheless, it would appear that he is still looking for his context. Whereas The Only Thing You Know stood out with its unique qualities and timing, Taking Care is only one of many excellent Canadian features released this year.

If Taking Care harks back to an earlier period of filmmaking, it represents a significant step forward into the mainstream for Mackey. In many respects he is perhaps lucky to have been saved the critical savaging that many of his peers received during the tax shelter years. He has put on weight and his hair is shorter, but the Clarke Mackey of 1987 remains remarkably like his determined, younger self — just more relaxed and in less of a hurry. He is now married, with a young son who is about to begin his daycare years. Once again Mackey has been able to balance his interests in children and filmmaking, a unique combination of life and art.
Cinema Canada: You began your early training in theatre with Robert Gill at the University of Toronto Summer Theatre Workshop. How did this come about?

Clarke Mackey: When I went to U. of T. that summer I was actually living in Oshawa. We hadn't moved to Toronto yet and I was about 15. I had always been interested in movies, but I thought it was just such an impossible thing then. It was so 'out there', especially for someone who didn't even live in Toronto.

When I was a child I would build elaborate sets, recruit all of my friends, and tell them what to do. So my father found out about this summer theatre course. I was actually too young to be in it, but I talked them into it. I'm not sure how, but I did. I had a wonderful time.

Cinema Canada: You were only 16 when you made your first 16mm short, On Nothing Days.

Clarke Mackey: When I was a teenager I thought that I had to do everything right away. I thought that if I hadn't made a feature film by the time I was 20, I was, you know, over the hill. There weren't any film courses at that point, but I was fortunate enough to meet a woman who made films for the Toronto Board of Education. She had equipment — a Bolex, a Moviola, splicers, and things like that — and took it upon herself to teach me how to do things. I had absolutely no training at all. I just figured it out myself, got help from various people, and put that film together. It was shown in a number of places and finally the CBC picked it up. I think it won an award at a National Film Board contest or something like that. I actually made enough money to pay my lab bill.

Cinema Canada: Grass came next in 1968, in a style strongly influenced by Michelangelo Antonioni.

Clarke Mackey: I was really going through an Antonioni phase. Grass is not a terribly good film — sort of an adolescent love story — but it's very rich visually. It's all about a guy who hides behind his camera. The big film for me at that time was Blow Up. I saw it about four or five times. We were making something that was pretty and we were fooling around with things in different ways. So I learned a great deal working on that film. It's not a film I would want to show to very many people, although the CBC did buy it as well.

Cinema Canada: You were still in your teens when you got a job with the CBC as an assistant editor?

Clarke Mackey: I hated school and all I wanted to do was leave it. I took the films that I had made down to the CBC and I talked them into hiring me. I had to promise them that I would go to night school. I did do that for a couple of years, but I never did finish my high school. I worked in the rushes room of the CBC at 22 Front Street, the Cassidy building, which also had Film House in it. There were some wonderful editors there and I learned a lot. I worked mostly on dramas.

Cinema Canada: At the Corporation you worked with Pen Densham and Ron Kelly, who made contributions to cinema vérité and early dramatic works at the CBC.

Clarke Mackey: I worked with Pen Densham before I worked with the CBC. This was when he was working at Film House. I used to take my stuff down there and we got to be friends. He shot two of my films and I edited his very first film before Insight Productions was created.

I worked with Ron Kelly at the CBC. I was brought on as a co-editor of Meganthic Outlaw. It was one of those Canadian mythical stories, which, of course, nobody in Canada knows about. Ron spent several years researching and writing the script and I really think, in some ways, it is his finest work. It's really an extraordinary drama. His request was for someone young who could edit as well as being an assistant editor. The powers that be at the CBC decided that I was the proper young person to work with him and we really got along great. The show was good and eventually it won some awards. He taught me a lot.

Cinema Canada: It would seem that the two major influences on the making of The Only Thing You Know, in
"I'm very nervous about slickness. I have always liked films that have rough edges, that have a sort of spontaneous quality."

and gave me a sense of legitimacy as a person — they gave my reality a sense of legitimacy. There was also something about the formal roughness of those films that attracted me, and still attracts me today. I'm very nervous about slickness. I have always liked films that have rough edges, that have a sort of spontaneous quality. So I was very excited about Nobody Waved Goodbye. Don Owen must have driven the actors crazy. He must have driven everybody crazy! But the feeling that have a sort of spontaneous quality.

"I think one of the things that I've always been interested in is the idea of making cinema a less exclusive art form. It's my belief that a lot of people could make films if they had the tools and the resources to do it."
Clarke Mackey: I think that the reason I took the job was (A) I had a lot of ambivalence about the film business as a way of making a living and I wasn't happy with what was happening with me in the business, and (B) I was poor and I needed a regular job. For me the most exciting thing about York, besides meeting and working with some very interesting students, was meeting Peter Harison. He gave me a new way of looking at films and filmmaking. York allowed me the time to think about what I was doing and it was there that I decided that I wanted to stop directing films. Perhaps forever, but certainly for a while.

Cinema Canada: In 1977 you made A Right to Live, an experiment in community-access filmmaking, made with the involvement of injured workers. Do you see this as a turning point in your career?

Clarke Mackey: In many ways the film was the end of that period. You see, what A Right to Live did was to combine my interests in community filmmaking, which I had been doing with the Regent Park Workshop and others, and a more professional approach to filmmaking. I wanted to do a film where there was a lot of involvement with the subjects of the film. I thought that by using some of the rhetoric of the Challenge for Change program at the Film Board I would let the subjects speak for themselves and let them shape the material to a certain extent.

Maybe it isn't a good film according to conventional kinds of standards. However, it is one of my favourites. It was used by the union of injured workers and by people within the labour movement to generate discussion and to increase consciousness. It's distributed by DFC Films and I still get cheques in the mail, small ones, but I still get cheques. Seeing my work being used in a social context is very important to me and so I value A Right to Live.

However, I realized that I had come to the end of my rope in terms of filmmaking. I really didn't want to make any more films. So after two years at York I took off and went to Europe for several months and travelled. I came back to Canada and decided to pursue this idea of creating a context in which non-professionals could create art.

Cinema Canada: So you turned to work in professional child care?

Clarke Mackey: It wasn't a grand decision. It started because a friend of mine was doing a Master's thesis on women in the labour force. Without the camera just to be with the kids. Within a few months I had enrolled in Seneca College in the Early Childhood Education Program and a few months after that I was working in the field.

During that time I was still doing film editing and I got a phone call from a woman named Pasia Schonberg who was making a film about pre-schoolers. She talked me into editing her film which was called Maybe Yes, Maybe No. Pasia's second film was about an art teacher who had been a big influence on her, named Dorothy Medhurst, who was working at the Institute of Child Study at the time. Through working on that film I met Dorothy and she became a major influence on me. For three years, in the early '80s, I ran my own nursery in the Don Vale region of Toronto. It was a really wonderful school and sometimes I still miss it.

Cinema Canada: Your experience with children led you back to filmmaking in 1984 with All Day Long about the crisis in the daycare system, and Pulling Flowers, in 1985, an experimental look at pushing young people to achieve early. Both were produced by Babs Church for TVO.

Clarke Mackey: When I was working at Don Vale I was approached by Babs. She had money to make a film about daycare. She knew about my past experience as a film director and said, "Clarke, you are the perfect person to make this film because you know the field very well." I was very nervous about this because it had been six or seven years since I had made a film, but I decided to go ahead. It worked out really well.

I guess I have a lot of distrust of producers, but it was so good working with Babs. She just seemed like the ideal kind of producer, someone who gave you really solid feedback and was creatively involved as well. So after we made All Day Long I went to her and said, "Look, you are making social issue programs. What about making a drama?" She said, "We've already thought about that and it's too expensive." And I said, "I'll make you a half-hour drama for the same price as a half-hour documentary." So we decided on an issue that we both felt was important, which is the 'hurried child' syndrome. We did our research and I wrote a script. We brought in Becky Schechter to rewrite the script and we shot Pulling Flowers on a budget of less than $50,000. Mark Irwin was the cameraman and François Vallet and Kate Lynch were in it.

It was pretty experimental. I think, for television. It had black and white and colour fantasy scenes. In fact, it was very different from the films I had made up to that point. Anyway, after Pulling Flowers, I thought that we should take the leap of faith and make a feature-length film. Babs was 100 percent behind it.

Cinema Canada: You said that the idea for Taking Care came from a 1985 newspaper article by June Callwood on the role of the nurses in the Sick Children's tragic baby deaths. What sparked your interest in this article?

Clarke Mackey: I was as interested as anyone in the Grange Inquiry, but what was crucial for me about the article was Callwood's suggestion that there was a correspondance between how the nurses are treated in the medical system and the way women are treated in society. What interested me was the most I was trying to explore that parallel. The other thing that June said was that the nurses had a certain kind of faith in the system generally and that belief was shaken to the core because of the extraordinary events that happened. So, in a sense, it was an awakening of consciousness, or a loss of innocence.

It was these larger questions which focused on a specific situation that I wanted to explore in the film. I realized fairly quickly that to try and do the Susan Nelles story would be almost impossible because it is far too complex and it had no resolution. I decided to go with a fic-
Clarke Mackey: My experience has been that I do spend an inordinate amount of time worrying about that sort of thing because it is extremely difficult to finance any film. It is particularly difficult to finance films that are not considered to be commercial as defined by the people who make those decisions—distributors, exhibitors, etc.

I think that in this country we are at a point where there are two roads to take, and maybe the answer is to take both of them. I'll tell you what those roads are. The one road is towards a very market-oriented, commercial approach to feeding the big animal of satellite, cable, and theatrical distribution. The other is towards the personal, the questioning, the oppositional, the experimental, the more difficult kinds of films. I think both kinds of things are being done now in Canada. My concern is that the commercial interests will win out.

It is important to have an industry that is economically viable, but what I plead for with the commercial interests is that they have a more open mind and allow for work which is not conventional. I think that a healthy industry should have both of these things. I'm very concerned that this won't happen. If you can't make a feature film for less than $5 million then there are all kinds of movies that will never get made. We could do some very interesting work of a variety of kinds in this country if only we can be flexible.

Clarke Mackey: When we first wrote the script for Taking Care it had a very depressing ending. The nurses got screwed. The hospital won and everything was a lot worse off than it was before. We actually went through two drafts with this kind of ending. Some-what was in New Brunswick and said, "Send me the script" and that was it. I was very pleased to be working with her because she has a wonderful approach to theatre and film.

Clarke Mackey: The whole question of good guys vs. bad guys is something that's been brought up a lot by people who have seen the film. Interestingly enough, now the film is out, people who work in the medical system, not the doctors, but nurses and other medical personnel, actually think the film is fairly realistic. But it seems there are a lot of people who think the doctors are portrayed as villains. This was not our intention. We thought we were making them more human, but it didn't come across that way. It's definitely an aspect of the film that is problematic.

Clarke Mackey: I do feel that for the first time I could name about four or five producers, people with real clout and power, who want to do this kind of film. Who don't want to just go for the quick buck and the commercial thing. When we showed it to Geoff Pevere for the first time he said, "My God, a Canadian film that ends like this!"

Clarke Mackey: the hassle and-what! syndrome — Actors hang around while Mackey and crew set up a shot.