

ing to Isherwood, "it was a brilliant production done under great difficulties, because it was part of a series of plays and each play had only a week to run. The production was done without any props except for a seat which which was necessary for the plot. It went extremely well."

What developed next will give new hope to advocates of the Peter Principle. Isherwood was very excited at the prospect of his play appearing on the Great White Way;

his cut is a model for young journalists grasping for the diplomatic skill to say "it was a flop." His only kind remarks concerned a minor part played by Sam Jaffe (the high lama in the film "Lost Horizon, 1938).

This reviewer did not see the play so I can only speculate about the reasons for its short run.

1. The theater was too big. Isherwood is a gay cult figure these days—witness this long notice—but his appeal is not sufficiently large to

very old theater (built in 1913) meant for musicals.

Isherwood claims to have had no premonitions of disaster. "The opening night gave no hint of what was going to happen with the critics. We had a very appreciative audience. We absolutely did not foresee the almost universal critical verdict against it (three newspaper and television critics panned it)." Did the homosexual angle to the

(Continued on page 6)



**Keith Baxter (left) and Simon Ward debate Eastern vs. Western mores in "A Meeting by the River"**

## Hawaii rights dies

HONOLULU—Two controversial bills that would have banned discrimination against gays in Hawaii's job and housing markets have been killed in a last-minute move by the House of Representatives Democratic leadership.

The gay rights measures had the majority support of the House Public Employment and Government Operations Committee, according to committee chairperson Rep. Kate Stanley.

But neither bill has hit the House floor for a third-reading vote, and both are now considered dead for at least this year.

Stanley said House Speaker James Waiaksohi prevailed upon her to hold the measures "because of their emotional nature." Another top Democratic lawmaker, Majority Leader Henry Peters, said there were problems with the bills' wording.

"Conceptually, I'm in favor of it (gay rights)," said Peters. "And I felt the wording was too restrictive."

The dissidents note—and Stanley confirmed—that there were enough signatures on the committee reports to move both bills to the House floor for a vote.

## Salem bill dies too

SALEM—A measure that would have prohibited discrimination against gays in state employment died last month in the Senate Aging and Minority Affairs Committee.

The measure, Senate Bill 599, was the first piece of gay rights legislation to be acted upon in the 1979 Legislature. Several other gay rights bills are pending in committees.

The committee voted 4-1 to table the bill, effectively killing it. The measure would have prohibited discrimination based on sexual orientation in state service, as long as the person's sexual preference and conduct does not bear a demonstrable relationship to his effectiveness on the job. The bill also would have prohibited the disciplining of state employees based on such discrimination.

State law already prohibits discrimination in state service based on sex, race, marital status, religious or political beliefs, and age (between 18 and 65).

Sen. Jan Wyers (D-Portland),

who opposed the bill, said an opinion from Attorney General Jim Redden raised the question of whether such a bill is necessary to protect people from discriminatory action because of their sexual preference. In a letter to the committee, Redden said he supported the bill.

However, Redden said: "I question whether, under present law, the state of Oregon can discriminate on the basis of sexual orientation where such preference or conduct does not bear a demonstrable relationship to the effective performance of the employment assignment in question. In any event, the state should not so discriminate and this statute presumably would eliminate such discrimination."

Wyers said the issue presented in SB599 is one that he finds "very difficult" to decide. While he considers himself a proponent of civil rights, he said, he was schooled to see that issue confined to civil rights for such racial minorities as blacks and Mexican-Americans.