

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post last Friday, entitled "Courthouse Politics."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the editorial will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3280) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 so as to authorize a study for the purpose of determining the feasibility of locating the Court of Claims, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States near the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kennedy, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(The editorial presented by Mr. Kennedy is as follows:)

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1960]

COURTHOUSE POLITICS

A choice corner fronting on Lafayette Square is swiftly becoming a site for sore eyes (of Texas) as a result of a quarrel involving three courts all in search of a new home. All the courts—the Courts of Claims, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and Tax Court—are in urgent need of more space. On this there is little dispute. The plight of the Court of Claims is especially desperate; because the court deals only with cases involving the Government, its docket has grown at an awesome rate (6,000 cases are now pending) while its quarters have failed to keep pace.

But is Lafayette Square the appropriate site for a courthouse? Chief Judge Marvin Jones of the Court of Claims contends that his bench should be given sole occupancy of the site on Madison Place and H Street NW. now occupied by the old Belasco Theater and Dolley Madison House. Judge Jones, a former Texas Congressman, points out that the General Services Administration has assigned the site to his court and that the House Public Works Committee has endorsed the move.

At this point, Chief Judge Eugene Worley, of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, enters a sharp dissent. His court, too, is in dire need of more space and he proposes the addition of 30,000 square feet to the Lafayette Square edifice so that both courts could be housed together. Chief Judge Worley, also a former Texas Congressman, feels this could be done with a minimum of delay. And doubtless it would be desirable if another 90,000 square feet could be found for the Tax Court.

To a bewildered bystander, one alternative seems clear. The needs of all the courts could be met adequately in a "judiciary square" on the east side of the Supreme Court Building. This is the proposal previously endorsed by both the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission. Not only would it mean that an area could be created which would comport with judicial dignity (the buildings, perhaps, could be grouped around an Oliver Wendell Holmes Memorial Park) but also that Lafayette Square could then be preserved for an executive use more in keeping with its historical values and its proximity to the White House.

Granted that such a change in plans would mean further delay, and granted that the location might be more inconvenient for the Court of Claims, we still think the idea of grouping the courts in a more suitable site deserves further consideration before the bulldozers begin their work. To meet the problems of delay, surely further space in other Government buildings—or leased private quarters—could be found on a short-term basis.

[From the Congressional Record, Mar. 24, 1960]

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959, RELATING TO LOCATION FOR NEW U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS BUILDING

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in an editorial on March 18, the Washington Post called attention again to the plans going forward to use the sites surrounding Lafayette Park, now occupied by several historic structures, for construction of a new office building to house the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.