

the amount of interstate travel and communication required to establish and collect on child support orders and a burden on custodial parents that is expensive, time consuming, and disruptive of occupations and commercial activity;

“(B) contribute to the pressing problem of relatively low levels of child support payments in interstate cases and to inequities in child support payments levels that are based solely on the non-custodial parent’s choice of residence;

“(C) encourage a disregard of court orders resulting in massive arrearages nationwide;

“(D) allow noncustodial parents to avoid the payment of regularly scheduled child support payments for extensive periods of time, resulting in substantial hardship for the children for whom support is due and for their custodians; and

“(E) lead to the excessive relitigation of cases and to the establishment of conflicting orders by the courts of various jurisdictions, resulting in confusion, waste of judicial resources, disrespect for the courts, and a diminution of public confidence in the rule of law; and

“(4) among the results of the conditions described in this subsection are—

“(A) the failure of the courts of the States to give full faith and credit to the judicial proceedings of the other States;

“(B) the deprivation of rights of liberty and property without due process of law;

“(C) burdens on commerce among the States; and

“(D) harm to the welfare of children and their parents and other custodians.

“(b) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—In view of the findings made in subsection (a), it is necessary to establish national standards under which the courts of the various States shall determine their jurisdiction to issue a child support order and the effect to be given by each State to child support orders issued by the courts of other States.

“(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act [enacting this section and provisions set out as a note under section 1 of this title] are—

“(1) to facilitate the enforcement of child support orders among the States;

“(2) to discourage continuing interstate controversies over child support in the interest of greater financial stability and secure family relationships for the child; and

“(3) to avoid jurisdictional competition and conflict among State courts in the establishment of child support orders.”

### § 1738C. Certain acts, records, and proceedings and the effect thereof

No State, territory, or possession of the United States, or Indian tribe, shall be required to give effect to any public act, record, or judicial proceeding of any other State, territory, possession, or tribe respecting a relationship between persons of the same sex that is treated as a marriage under the laws of such other State, territory, possession, or tribe, or a right or claim arising from such relationship.

(Added Pub. L. 104-199, §2(a), Sept. 21, 1996, 110 Stat. 2419.)

### § 1739. State and Territorial nonjudicial records; full faith and credit

All nonjudicial records or books kept in any public office of any State, Territory, or Possession of the United States, or copies thereof, shall be proved or admitted in any court or office in any other State, Territory, or Possession by the attestation of the custodian of such records or books, and the seal of his office an-

nexed, if there be a seal, together with a certificate of a judge of a court of record of the county, parish, or district in which such office may be kept, or of the Governor, or secretary of state, the chancellor or keeper of the great seal, of the State, Territory, or Possession that the said attestation is in due form and by the proper officers.

If the certificate is given by a judge, it shall be further authenticated by the clerk or prothonotary of the court, who shall certify, under his hand and the seal of his office, that such judge is duly commissioned and qualified; or, if given by such Governor, secretary, chancellor, or keeper of the great seal, it shall be under the great seal of the State, Territory, or Possession in which it is made.

Such records or books, or copies thereof, so authenticated, shall have the same full faith and credit in every court and office within the United States and its Territories and Possessions as they have by law or usage in the courts or offices of the State, Territory, or Possession from which they are taken.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 947.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 688 (R.S. § 906).

Words “Possession of the United States” were substituted for “or any country subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.”

Words “or copies thereof” were added in two places. Copies have always been used to prove records and books under section 688 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., and the addition of these words clarifies the former implied meaning of such section.

In the first paragraph of the revised section words “a judge of a court of record” were substituted for words “the presiding justice of the court” and in the second paragraph “judge” was substituted for “presiding justice” for convenience and without change of substance.

Words “and its Territories and Possessions” were added after “United States”, near the end of the section, in view of provisions of section 688 of title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., for the admission of records and books in any court or office in any other State, Territory, or “in any such country.” (Changed to “Possession” in this section.)

See also Rule 44 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Changes were made in phraseology.

### § 1740. Copies of consular papers

Copies of all official documents and papers in the office of any consul or vice consul of the United States, and of all official entries in the books or records of any such office, authenticated by the consul or vice consul, shall be admissible equally with the originals.

(June 25, 1948, ch. 646, 62 Stat. 947.)

#### HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 28, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 677 (R.S. § 896; Apr. 5, 1906, ch. 1366, § 3, 34 Stat. 100).

Words “authenticated by the consul or vice consul” were substituted for “certified under the hand and seal of such officer”, for clarity. Words “in the courts of the United States”, were omitted after “admissible”. Such papers should be so admitted in all courts consistently with sections 1738 and 1739 of this title.

See also Rule 44 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Changes were made in phraseology.