

to \$1.25 an hour, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 2099. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the admission of West Virginia into the Union as a State (Rept. No. 466).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 111. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the week following the Fourth of July as Captive Nations Week (Rept. No. 467).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

H.R. 904. An act to rename the New Richmond locks and dam in the State of Ohio as the Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam (Rept. No. 469).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1965. A bill to establish certain provisions with respect to the removal and the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies (Rept. No. 471).

AMENDMENT OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT OF 1933—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 3460) to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 470) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with supplemental and individual views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES—PRINTING OF INDIVIDUAL VIEWS AS PART 2 OF SENATE REPORT 451

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the junior Senator from Illinois, which I will file shortly, on the bill (S. 716) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the anti-trust laws, and for other purposes, may be printed as part 2 of report No. 451.

I have cleared this matter with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

REPORT OF DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. CORTON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 2326. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an interpleader compact between or among any two or more of the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 2327. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the better registration of births in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 2328. A bill to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2329. A bill for the relief of Georges Khoury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 2330. A bill for the relief of John B. Banthey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S.J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution relating to the right of a State to enact legislation on the basis of its own public policy on questions of decency and morality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. EASTLAND when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INTERPLEADER COMPACT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CORTON], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which will authorize the respective States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories and possessions of the United States to enter into an interpleader compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2326) granting the consent of Congress to an interpleader compact between or among any two or more of the States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, compacts between States are covered by article 1, section 10 of the Federal Constitution. This section provides that no State shall enter into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power without the consent of Congress.

It has become apparent in recent years that technological and business developments have practically obliterated State lines in all endeavors, but particularly in the field of business with the resulting legal disputes which necessarily follow. It is, indeed, difficult to find a person today who does not have a contractual relationship with a person or a corporation in another State. One need only examine his insurance policies or banking slips to immediately realize that contracts frequently extend across State lines.

When a dispute arises relative to the enforcement of any one of these contracts, the ultimate legal difficulties which follow primarily center around the question of an adequate forum where all the parties to the dispute can be heard without a multiplicity of actions. Interpleader actions are allowed in Federal courts where the amount involved is \$500 or more and a diversity of citizenship exists. However, there has been no adequate remedy where the amount involved is less than \$500.

In recognition of this and other problems in this area, the Council of State Governments has proposed a uniform interpleader compact which already has been adopted by five Eastern States. The bill which I am introducing would promote judicial cooperation among those States which decide to adopt interpleader compacts. It would relieve the uncertainty of persons who may be subject to double or multiple liability by permitting one judicial determination of the rights of all adverse claimants. In other words, this legislation will provide a judicial procedure by which two or more persons who have adverse claims against a third person may litigate these claims in one action.

It further provides that service of process will be legally recognized as binding between residents of compacting States, provided it meets the minimum standards in the jurisdiction where the proceeding is pending as well as that of the State where the service is made. Judgments obtained in compliance with this compact will not be subject to attack on the ground that the adjudicating court did not have personal jurisdiction over the parties to the action.

Provision is also made for withdrawal from the compact by any State at its discretion.