

No one can deny that the workload of these courts makes it imperative that they be provided with expanded quarters. But I entirely share the objection of the Washington Post to using the sites around Lafayette Park for that purpose. A much better idea is the one offered by the Post that they be grouped around the U.S. Supreme Court Building as recommended by the National Capital Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial from the Washington Post printed at this point in my remarks.

(There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:)

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

COURTHOUSE POLICIES

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 Court 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 Dolly 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.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in order to get a restudy of the question of locating the needed new courthouses, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill directing the General Services Administration to bring together recommendations from itself, the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts to determine the feasibility of a "judiciary square" proposal. These recommendations would be brought back to the House and Senate Committees on Public Works for further action.

The old Belasco Theater is one of the buildings which would be razed if the new courthouse were constructed on the square. The February 21, 1960, issue of the Post carried an editorial on the Belasco Theater and its place in the history of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, too, appear at this point in my remarks.