

that the underlying domain name system and technical infrastructure of the Internet remain stable and secure;

Whereas the Internet was created in the United States and has flourished under United States supervision and oversight, and the Federal Government has followed a path of transferring Internet control from the defense sector to the civilian sector, including the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) with the goal of full privatization;

Whereas the developing world deserves the access to knowledge, services, commerce, and communication, the accompanying benefits to economic development, education, and health care, and the informed discussion that is the bedrock of democratic self-government that the Internet provides;

Whereas the explosive and hugely beneficial growth of the Internet did not result from increased government involvement but from the opening of the Internet to commerce and private sector innovation;

Whereas on June 30, 2005, President George W. Bush announced that the United States intends to maintain its historic role over the master “root zone” file of the Internet, which lists all authorized top-level Internet domains;

Whereas the recently articulated principles of the United States on the domain name and addressing system of the Internet (DNS) are that—

(1) the Federal Government will—

(A) preserve the security and stability of the DNS;

(B) take no action with the potential to adversely affect the effective and efficient operation of the DNS; and

(C) maintain the historic role of the United States regarding modifications to the root zone file;

(2) governments have a legitimate interest in the management of country code top level domains (ccTLD);

(3) the United States is committed to working with the international community to address the concerns of that community in accordance with the stability and security of the DNS;

(4) ICANN is the appropriate technical manager of the Internet, and the United States will continue to provide oversight so that ICANN maintains focus and meets its core technical mission; and

(5) dialogue relating to Internet governance should continue in multiple relevant fora, and the United States encourages an ongoing dialogue with all stakeholders and will continue to support market-based approaches and private sector leadership;

Whereas the final report issued by the Working Group on Internet Governance (WGIG), established by the United Nations Secretary General in accordance with a mandate given during the first World Summit on the Information Society, and comprised of 40 members from governments, private sector, and civil society, issued 4 possible models, 1 of which envisages a Global Internet Council that would assume international Internet governance;

Whereas that report contains recommendations for relegating the private sector and nongovernmental organizations to an advisory capacity;

Whereas the European Union has also proposed transferring control of the Internet, including the global allocation of Internet Protocol number blocks, procedures for changing the root zone file, and rules applicable to DNS, to a “new model of international cooperation” which could confer significant leverage to the Governments of Iran, Cuba, and China, and could impose an undesirable layer of politicized bureaucracy

on the operations of the Internet that could result in an inadequate response to the rapid pace of technological change;

Whereas some nations that advocate radical change in the structure of Internet governance censor the information available to their citizens through the Internet and use the Internet as a tool of surveillance to curtail legitimate political discussion and dissent, and other nations operate telecommunications systems as state-controlled monopolies or highly-regulated and highly-taxed entities;

Whereas some nations in support of transferring Internet governance to an entity affiliated with the United Nations, or another international entity, might seek to have such an entity endorse national policies that block access to information, stifle political dissent, and maintain outmoded communications structures;

Whereas the structure and control of Internet governance has profound implications for homeland security, competition and trade, democratization, free expression, access to information, privacy, and the protection of intellectual property, and the threat of some nations to take unilateral actions that would fracture the root zone file would result in a less functional Internet with diminished benefits for all people;

Whereas in the Declaration of Principles of the First World Summit on the Information Society, held in Geneva in 2003, delegates from 175 nations declared the “common desire and commitment to build a people-centered, inclusive and development oriented Information Society, where everyone can create, access, utilize and share information and knowledge”;

Whereas delegates at the First World Summit also reaffirmed, “as an essential foundation of the Information Society, and as outlined in Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression” and that “this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and import information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers”;

Whereas the United Nations Secretary General has stated the objective of the 2005 World Summit on the Information Society in Tunis is to ensure “benefits that new information and communication technologies, including the Internet, can bring to economic and social development” and that “to defend the Internet is to defend freedom itself”; and

Whereas discussions at the November 2005 World Summit on the Information Society may include discussion of transferring control of the Internet to a new intergovernmental entity, and could be the beginning of a prolonged international debate regarding the future of Internet governance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on the President to continue to oppose any effort to transfer control of the Internet to the United Nations or any other international entity;

(2) applauds the President for—

(A) clearly and forcefully asserting that the United States has no present intention of relinquishing the historic leadership role the United States has played in Internet governance; and

(B) articulating a vision of the future of the Internet that places privatization over politicization with respect to the Internet; and

(3) calls on the President to—

(A) recognize the need for, and pursue a continuing and constructive dialogue with the international community on, the future of Internet governance; and

(B) advance the values of an open Internet in the broader trade and diplomatic conversations of the United States.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR PEOPLE OF SRI LANKA

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 324, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 324) expressing support for the people of Sri Lanka in the wake of the tsunami and the assassination of the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister and urging support and respect for free and fair elections in Sri Lanka.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 324) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 324

Whereas, on December 26, 2004, Sri Lanka was struck by a tsunami that left some 30,000 dead and hundreds of thousands of people homeless;

Whereas the United States and the world community recognized the global importance of preventing that tragedy from spiraling into an uncontrolled disaster and sent aid to Sri Lanka to provide immediate relief;

Whereas the massive tsunami reconstruction effort in Sri Lanka creates significant challenges for the country;

Whereas the democratic process in Sri Lanka is further challenged by the refusal of the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, a group that the Secretary of State has designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization, to renounce violence as a means of effecting political change;

Whereas, on August 12, 2005, the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister Lakhsman Kadirgamar was assassinated at his home in Colombo in a brutal terrorist act that has been widely attributed to the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam by officials in Sri Lanka, the United States, and other countries;

Whereas democratic elections are scheduled to be held in Sri Lanka on November 17, 2005; and

Whereas the United States has an interest in a free and fair democratic process in Sri Lanka, and the peaceful resolution of the insurgency that has afflicted Sri Lanka for more than two decades: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses its support for the people of Sri Lanka as they recover from the devastating tsunami that occurred on December 26, 2004, and the assassination of the Sri Lankan Foreign Minister Lakhsman Kadirgamar on August 12, 2005;

(2) expresses its support for the courageous decision by the democratically-elected Government of Sri Lanka, following the assassination of Foreign Minister Kadirgamar, to remain in discussions with the Liberation

Tigers of Tamil Eelam in an attempt to resolve peacefully the issues facing the people of Sri Lanka; and

(3) urges all parties in Sri Lanka to remain committed to the negotiating process and to make every possible attempt at national reconciliation.

AUTHORIZATION FOR PRINTING OF SENATE ELECTION LAW GUIDE-BOOK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 325, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 325) to authorize the printing of a revised edition of the Senate Election Law Guidebook.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 325) was agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 325

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration shall prepare a revised edition of the Senate Election Law Guidebook, Senate Document 106-14, and that such document shall be printed as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed, beyond the usual number, 500 additional copies of the document specified in the first section for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CHILD SAFETY PILOT PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 298, S. 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1961) to extend and expand the Child Safety Pilot Program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1961) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1961

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Extending the Child Safety Pilot Program Act of 2005”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE CHILD SAFETY PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 108 of the PROTECT Act (42 U.S.C. 5119a note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “A volunteer organization in a participating State may not submit background check requests under paragraph (3).”;

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “a 30-month” and inserting: “a 60-month”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS.—

“(i) ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATIONS.—Eligible organizations include—

“(I) the Boys and Girls Clubs of America;

“(II) the MENTOR/National Mentoring Partnership;

“(III) the National Council of Youth Sports; and

“(IV) any nonprofit organization that provides care, as that term is defined in section 5 of the National Child Protection Act of 1993 (42 U.S.C. 5119c), for children.

“(ii) PILOT PROGRAM.—The eligibility of an organization described in clause (i)(IV) to participate in the pilot program established under this section shall be determined by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children according to criteria established by such Center, including the potential number of applicants and suitability of the organization to the intent of this section.”;

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) APPLICANTS FROM PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS.—Participating organizations may request background checks on applicants for positions as volunteers and employees who will be working with children or supervising volunteers.”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D), by striking “the organizations described in subparagraph (C)” and inserting “participating organizations”; and

(v) in subparagraph (F), by striking “14 business days” and inserting “10 business days”;

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by striking “and 2005” and inserting “through 2008”.

VESSEL HULL DESIGN PROTECTION AMENDMENTS of 2005

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1785 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1785) to amend chapter 13 of title 17, United States Code (relating to the vessel hull design protection), to clarify the distinction between a hull and a deck, to provide factors for the determination of the protectability of a revised design, to provide guidance for assessments of substantial similarity, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Senator CORNYN and I have already worked together on significant Freedom of Information Act legislation and on counterfeiting legislation during the first session of this Congress. Today, we pass yet another bill and take our partnership to the high seas, or at least to our Nation’s boat manufacturing industry, with the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments of 2005.

Designs of boat vessel hulls are often the result of a great deal of time, ef-

fort, and financial investment. They are afforded intellectual property protection under the Vessel Hull Design Protection Act that Congress passed in 1998. This law exists for the same reason that other works enjoy intellectual property rights: to encourage continued innovation, to protect the works that emerge from the creative process, and to reward the creators. Recent courtroom experience has made it clear that the protections Congress passed 7 years ago need some statutory refinement to ensure they meet the purposes we envisioned. The Vessel Hull Design Protection Act Amendments shore up the law, making an important clarification about the scope of the protections available to boat designs.

We continue to be fascinated with, and in so many ways dependent on, bodies of water, both for recreation and commerce. More than 50 percent of Americans live on or near the coastline in this country. We seem always to be drawn to the water, whether it is the beautiful Lake Champlain in my home State of Vermont or the world’s large oceans. And as anyone who has visited our seaports can attest, much of our commerce involves sea travel. I would like to thank Senators KOHL and HATCH for cosponsoring this legislation. Protecting boat designs and encouraging innovation in those designs are worthy aims, and I am grateful that we have moved to pass this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1785) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1785

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Vessel Hull Design Protection Amendments of 2005”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNS PROTECTED.

Section 1301(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) VESSEL FEATURES.—The design of a vessel hull or deck, including a plug or mold, is subject to protection under this chapter, notwithstanding section 1302(4).”

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 1301(b) of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking “vessel hull, including a plug or mold,” and inserting “vessel hull or deck, including a plug or mold.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (4) and inserting the following:

“(4) A ‘hull’ is the exterior frame or body of a vessel, exclusive of the deck, superstructure, masts, sails, yards, rigging, hardware, fixtures, and other attachments.”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) A ‘deck’ is the horizontal surface of a vessel that covers the hull, including exterior cabin and cockpit surfaces, and exclusive of masts, sails, yards, rigging, hardware, fixtures, and other attachments.”.