guage" to the effect that those laws were exclusive of any remedy under the laws of any other state would supplementary awards be precluded.[138] Although the overwhelming number of state court decisions since follow *McCartin*, and *Magnolia* has been little noticed, all the Justices expressed dissatisfaction with the former case as a rule of the Full Faith and Credit Clause, although a majority of the Court followed it and permitted a supplementary award.[139]

Full Faith and Credit and Statutes of Limitation.—The Full Faith and Credit Clause is not violated by a state statute providing that all suits upon foreign judgments shall be brought within five years after such judgment shall have been obtained, where the statute has been construed by the state courts as barring suits on foreign judgments, only if the plaintiff could not revive his judgment in the state where it was originally obtained.[140]

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT: MISCELLANY

Full Faith and Credit in Federal Courts

The rule of 28 U.S.C. §§ 1738–1739 pertains not merely to recognition by state courts of the records and judicial proceedings of courts of sister states but to recognition by "every court within the United States," including recognition of the records and proceedings of the courts of any territory or any country subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. The federal courts are bound to give to the judgments of the state courts the same faith and credit that the courts of one state are bound to give to the judgments of the courts of her sister states.[141] Where suits to enforce the laws of one state are entertained in courts of another on principles of comity, federal district courts sitting in that state may entertain them and

---

[138] 330 U.S. at 627–28, 630.

[139] Thomas v. Washington Gas Light Co., 448 U.S. 261 (1980). For the disapproval of *McCartin*, *see* id. at 269–72 (plurality opinion of four), 289 (concurring opinion of three), 291 (dissenting opinion of two). But the four Justice plurality would have instead overruled *Magnolia*, id. at 277–86, and adopted the rule of interest balancing used in deciding which state may apply its laws in the first place. The dissenting two Justices would have overruled *McCartin* and followed *Magnolia*. Id. at 290. The other Justices considered *Magnolia* the sounder rule but decided to follow *McCurtin* because it could be limited to workmen's compensation cases, thus requiring no evaluation of changes throughout the reach of the Full Faith and Credit Clause. Id. at 286.

[140] Watkins v. Conway, 385 U.S. 188, 190–91 (1965).

[141] Cooper v. Newell, 173 U.S. 555, 567 (1899), *See also* Pennington v. Gibson, 57 U.S. (16 How.) 65, 81 (1854); Cheever v. Wilson, 76 U.S. (9 Wall.) 108, 123 (1870); Wisconsin v. Pelican Ins. Co., 127 U.S. 265, 291 (1888); Swift v. McPherson, 232 U.S. 51 (1914); Baldwin v. Traveling Men's Ass'n, 283 U.S. 522 (1931); American Surety Co. v. Baldwin, 287 U.S. 156 (1932); Sanders v. Fertilizer Works, 292 U.S. 190 (1934); Durfee v. Duke, 375 U.S. 106 (1963); Allen v. McCurry, 449 U.S. 90 (1980); Kremer v. Chemical Const. Corp., 456 U.S. 461 (1982).