

But Dix encouraged him to stay in Florida, saying he would give the sermon on Sunday, Hunt said.

"He filled the pulpit for me and did an excellent job," Hunt said. "He got rave reviews and supplied the pulpit on my absences after that. I was about ready to swap places with him."

Scottie Willard, who retired in September as press foreman after 44 years at The State Journal, remembers when Dix became publisher in 1962.

"He made a lot of improvements as far as press equipment when he took over," Willard said. "He treated all employees really well, just like they were his family. He was a really good person all around."

Ronnie Martin, retired composing foreman who worked at the newspaper 43 years, agrees.

"He was super to work for," Martin said. "He gave me all sorts of opportunities and challenges at the same time, but they all worked out. He was a great guy. He treated everybody fairly."

Ann Maenza, Dix's daughter, now publisher of The State Journal, said her father "never cut corners. He always made sure things were done right. He was old school, fair and honest."

Amy Dix Rock, senior director of regulatory and scientific affairs at Cumberland Pharmaceuticals Inc. in Nashville, Tenn., said her father was "always thinking of others. We don't know how many things he's done for others because he didn't talk about it."

"That's the way he was. He was soft-spoken but when he did speak you listened."

Al Smith, who rose to prominence in the state as a weekly newspaper publisher and as the longtime host of KET's "Comment on Kentucky," said Dix was a newspaper publisher of the old school, "but the opposite of the domineering egotistic bosses who bullied employees and squeezed the news to match their biases."

"Old school" means that we always knew that with Al at The State Journal, it was like the grocery slogan of years ago, "the owner is in the store." He didn't have to call a distant headquarters to know what to say or do.

"He had strong views, conservative Republican in a 'company town' (state government) of readers who are mostly Democratic, but he ran the paper on principles of fairness in the news columns and gave his editorial writers, who were mostly more liberal than he, free rein on the opinion page."

Smith noted how The State Journal under Dix supported a constitutional amendment that overhauled the state's judicial system and created what is today the Supreme Court. Smith also noted the newspaper's spotlight on corruption in government and how Dix shunned personal publicity.

"Once I wrote him a private note about something very generous he had done to help someone in trouble," Smith said. "I heard nary a word in reply. But I didn't expect it. I am sure he was embarrassed that I even knew."

Born Aug. 18, 1929, in Ravenna, Ohio, Albert E. Dix majored in political science and was a 1951 graduate of Denison University in Granville, Ohio.

He served in the U.S. Army Intelligence from 1953-1955.

A fourth-generation journalist, Dix first worked at The Times-Leader in Bellaire, Ohio, where his father was publisher. He moved to Frankfort in October 1962 to become publisher of The State Journal. He retired in 1996 as publisher and president of Wooster Republican Printing Co., the parent company of The State Journal, which now owns seven newspapers.

The Kentucky Book Fair was founded by The State Journal in 1981.

Dix also was a member of the board of directors of First Capital Bank of Kentucky, the Frankfort/Franklin County Industrial Development Authority and the local Kiwanis Club; and served two terms as chairman of the American Saddlebred Museum at the Kentucky Horse Park in Lexington.

He loved fishing and making fishing rods, electric trains and saddlebred horses.

Other survivors include his wife of 56 years, Edna Dix; a son, Troy Dix, publisher of the Ashland Times-Gazette in Ohio; and four grandchildren, Evan, Stewart and Melissa Dix and Lauren Maenza.

## CUBA

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor for S. 428, the Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act.

It is time we brought our strengths to bear—our people, our vision, our energy—to help the Cuban people shape the future direction of Cuba and to fix a policy that has manifestly failed. For America to act as the great power we are, with confidence in our values and vision, we need a Cuba policy that looks forward.

The truth is, we have reached out to countries where our wounds were far deeper, and far more recent. When JOHN MCCAIN and I led the efforts to unfreeze our relationship with Vietnam, we said: "let's be honest . . . the Cold War is over. All the American trade embargo is doing is keeping Vietnam poor and thus encouraging a flood of refugees."

For nearly 20 years after the fall of Saigon, the Vietnam war took a less bloody but equally hostile form. The U.S. and Vietnam had no diplomatic relations. Vietnamese assets were frozen. Trade was embargoed. But in 1995 the United States normalized relations with Vietnam. The Cold War had ended, and we even signed a trade deal with a country where 58,000 Americans had given their lives.

The results? A Vietnam that is less isolated, more market-oriented, and, yes, freer—though it has miles to go.

And yet, when it comes to Cuba, a small, impoverished island 90 miles off the shores of Florida, we maintain a policy of embargo—motivated by past grievance, not present realities and future dreams. Fidel Castro has stepped aside from day-to-day government, there is a new American President, and Cuban-Americans increasingly want broad, far-reaching interaction across the Florida Straits. Times are changing, and we cannot live in the past.

Forty-seven years ago, I was in my first semester of college when Soviet missiles, deployed in Cuba, threatened to set the world on fire. No one who lived through those thirteen harrowing days in October will ever forget them. Certainly, the threat from Cuba was real.

It is true that we continue to disapprove of Cuba's dismal human rights record and palpable lack of freedom. And it is also true that, over 50 years, the embargo can claim some successes.

For example, it can be reasonably argued that U.S. pressure contributed to Cuba's decision to cease its military adventurism in Africa and its support for the violent insurgencies that ripped apart Central America in the 1980s.

But on the two most important questions, the verdict is decisive:

First, did this policy fulfill its oft-stated purpose of overthrowing the Castro regime? Fidel Castro outlasted nine American Presidents, from Eisenhower to Clinton, and retired only for reasons of health during the tenth. When he passed on the reins to his brother, Fidel joined Omar Bongo of Gabon and Libya's Colonel Qaddafi as one of the world's longest-serving head of states.

Second, have the benefits of our policy outweighed the costs? It is hard to argue they have. The embargo has cost Cubans access to our markets, and for many years to our food and medicine—with little progress to show. But it has cost us as well. It has limited the influence of our people and our democracy. What's more, this fall's U.N. vote condemning America's embargo showed yet again: Cuba is not the only country isolated by our policy. The vote against our policy was 187 to 3. All of our major allies voted against us, and one of the two voting with us itself routinely trades with Cuba.

Is it morally satisfying to sanction a government whose human rights practices we abhor and whose political system rejects many of our values? Sure. And helping Cubans to live in democracy and liberty absolutely remains a goal of American policy. But for 47 years now, we have endorsed an embargo in the name of democracy that produced no democracy!

In fact, our rhetoric and policies have actually helped to consolidate the Cuban government. We have provided the Castro regime with an all-purpose—if exaggerated—excuse to draw attention away from its many shortcomings, including its shamelessly flawed economic model. For too many Cubans, our threats have legitimized Castro's outsized nationalism and repression of opponents. Our posture has played to his strengths.

At the same time, we have not brought our strengths to bear—our people, our vision, our energy, our opportunities. It is time for America to act as the great power it is—with greatness built on confidence in our values and vision.

Of course, the greatest cost of our policy has been borne by the Cuban people themselves. José Martí, Cuba's great "Apostle" and man of letters, once said: "Everything that divides men, everything that classifies, separates or shuts off men, is a sin against humanity." More than 70 percent of Cuba's 11½ million people have lived their entire lives in this stalemate. A Cuban boy or girl of 10 when Fidel Castro drove victorious into Havana is 60 years old today. His whole life has been spent deprived of basic freedoms but

also deprived—in accordance with U.S. policies except during brief periods—of interaction with America's people.

We must have the courage to admit the need for a new approach. President Kennedy, who instituted sanctions against Cuba, had by mid-1963 set in motion secret contacts aimed at normalizing relations. Ford and Carter, too, looked for ways out of the box. George H.W. Bush cooperated with Cuba on the Angola peace accord, and his administration even dangled a promise of improved ties with America. Each initiative failed for a different reason, but all were grounded in the same recognition: there must be a better way forward.

Fortunately, we know there is a different strategy that can succeed. The Clinton administration worked to refocus our policy around what matters: on the Cuban people, not the Castro brothers; on the future, not the past; and on America's long-term national interests, not the political expediencies of a given moment.

The Clinton administration promoted people-to-people relations “unilaterally”—without conditions on Havana. We worked to improve bilateral cooperation on issues like migration and combating drug trafficking, which were clearly in our national interest. Family travel in both directions quickly skyrocketed. And tens of thousands of Americans from across society—church members, academics and students, medical professionals, athletes, journalists, and more—were permitted to interact with their Cuban counterparts.

Those policies sent a clear and effective message to the Cuban people: the United States is not who your leaders say we are. Our problem is not now, nor has it ever been, with the Cuban people. We completely changed the dynamic: A synagogue with holes in its roof so big that birds flew around the sanctuary has been repaired with funds and materials from American supporters. Environmentalists worked together to save species and protect our shared environment. The children who received bats and balls—and moral support—from Baltimore Orioles players visiting Cuba for an exhibition game will never forget the gesture of American generosity.

And guess what. Across the board, Cubans seeking a better future for their country have said that nothing energized civil society in Cuba more than contact with U.S. civil society. Even Cuba's human rights and democracy activists benefitted immeasurably from the contact.

Unfortunately, the Bush administration shut down most forms of contact and dramatically reduced our interactions to a tightly regulated, government controlled trickle. They tightened licensing procedures, reduced transparency, and put government in the people's way in what amounted to a unilateral suspension of Americans' ability to help Cubans shape their fu-

ture. People-to-people relations were made secretive, filtered, and for narrow objectives. That is the opposite of pro-democracy.

Regrettably, that was the record of the Bush administration: an enormous step backwards. Now it's up to the Obama administration to craft a Cuba policy that moves us forward.

In May 2008, Barack Obama said on the Presidential campaign trail that it was “time for a new strategy.” While he wasn't ready to give up the embargo as a source of leverage, he did declare at the Summit of the Americas: “The United States seeks a new beginning with Cuba,” and announced that he was “prepared to have [the] Administration engage with the Cuban government on a wide range of issues.”

As promised, the Obama administration has expanded licenses for Cuban-Americans—albeit only Cuban-Americans—to travel to Cuba. Controls on family remittances, gift parcels, and certain transactions with telecommunications companies were loosened as well. Mid-level talks about immigration matters and postal relations have resumed. And we've turned off an Orwellian electronic billboard flashing political messages from our Interests Section in Havana.

These are positive steps, but they are only a start. So what comes next?

At a minimum, the administration should use the authorities that it has to reinvigorate people-to-people relations—to unleash the energy of the American people who want to help Cubans build their future. The policy worked in the past and enjoyed wide support in both countries.

When announcing expanded family travel, the President said, “There are no better ambassadors for freedom than Cuban-Americans.” But I think it's also fair to say that there are excellent ambassadors for freedom among the 299 million other Americans—religious faithful, teachers and students, environmentalists, scholars, doctors and nurses, political scientists, and artists—whose challenging minds, economic success, love for democracy, and advocacy of solid American values make them proud ambassadors as well.

The New York Philharmonic and its board of directors have been brilliant representatives of America on trips to North Korea, Vietnam and around the world. I don't understand why the administration recently blocked their proposed trip to Cuba. What are we afraid of?

Second, as we reinvigorate people-to-people diplomacy, the administration should review the programs that the Bush administration funded generously to substitute for it.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is already undertaking an investigation into the need to reform Radio and TV Martí—programming beamed into Cuba at a cost of \$35 million a year. Many Cubans call TV Martí “La TV que no se ve” because it has never, in 18 years of broadcast, had a signifi-

cant audience in Cuba. Report after report has documented that the Martí services are hindered by bad management, weak professional tradecraft, and serious politicization. We are looking at whether its business model—as a “surrogate service” exempt from many Voice of America standards and regulations—has failed, and whether the TV service should be closed entirely and radio should be integrated into the high-quality VOA services. We ought to be especially concerned that human rights activists in Cuba a key bellwether audience are unanimous in their view that the Martí brand must be repaired.

Meanwhile, USAID's civil-society programs, totaling \$45 million in 2008, have noble objectives, but we need to examine whether we're achieving any of them. The Bush administration changed the program's focus from supporting the Cuban people to accelerating regime change, and the fact that some of our grantees have extravagantly high overheads has raised concerns about where all the money is going. It is also fair to ask whether these programs even work.

Bush's refocus on regime change made it difficult for Cubans outside declared antiregime groups to accept the informational materials or assistance offered—even if they had a burning desire for it. Our interests section used to distribute tens of thousands of books a year to Cubans across the political spectrum and the books could be seen, well-worn, in government and Communist party think tanks. Today, politicization has reduced the flow of information to many of the very same people eager to steer Cuba toward a better future.

The Foreign Relations Committee has begun a review of these programs. It is in the administration's interest to take the lead in overhauling them.

Finally, as I mentioned at the outset, I want to address legislation that will go even farther toward fixing our Cuba policy. S. 428, the Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act, does not lift the embargo or normalize relations. It merely stops our government from regulating or prohibiting travel to or from Cuba by U.S. citizens or legal residents, except in certain obviously inappropriate circumstances.

The Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act has strong support in Congress—33 sponsors in the Senate and 180 cosponsors for similar legislation in the House. I cosponsored similar legislation in the past, and I am proud to do so again. We are talking about restoring a fundamental American right—the right to travel—that is denied to Americans nowhere else in the world. Americans who can get a visa are free to travel to Iran, Iraq, Sudan, and even North Korea, and it makes no sense to deny them the right to travel to a poor island near Florida. There is a certain irony in the fact that Americans have to apply for licenses and wait, with little or no feedback, to travel to a country that we criticize for denying its

citizens the right to travel. The current ban on travel contravenes the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights' statement that "everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

Free travel also makes for good policy inside Cuba. Visits from Americans would have the same positive effects as people-to-people exchanges, but on a larger scale. Visiting Europeans and Canadians have already increased the flow of information and hard currency to ordinary Cubans, with a significant impact on the country. Cuba's economic model, for sure, remains profoundly flawed, and human rights conditions remain dismal. But the hard-currency sectors of the Cuban economy have significantly altered workers' dependence on the regime, introduced material incentives that are changing economic culture, and raised expectations, if not demands, for greater improvements in the future. After years of Cuban government propaganda, Americans are even better positioned than Europeans and Canadians to be catalysts of change. We can do more if we let them.

That is one reason why all of Cuba's major pro-democracy groups support free travel. Freedom House, Human Rights Watch, and other groups critical of Cuba's government agree. Studies of change in Eastern and Central Europe show a direct correlation between contact with the outside world and the peacefulness and durability of democratic transitions.

This is a policy whose time has come. Numerous polls of Americans—of Cuban origin and otherwise—show strong support. Non-Cuban-Americans have long supported easing restrictions. But here is what is surprising: one recent poll found that 59 percent of Cuban-Americans—the group most widely thought to oppose a change in policy—actually support allowing all American citizens to travel to Cuba. As the proportion of Cuban Americans who arrived after 1980 increases, support for free travel is only growing. In fact, even many Cuban émigrés 65 years and older, once passionately opposed to it, now favor free travel. This is a sea change in the attitudes of Cuban-Americans, and we should not ignore it.

Change is in the air—in Havana, in Washington, and in major Cuban-American communities. I don't personally hold high hopes that the transfer of power from Fidel to Raúl Castro and to the next generation of hand-picked loyalists portends rapid change, but it is obvious that the Cuba of today is not the Cuba of the 60s or even the 90s, and that our policy should not be stuck in time either. Cubans are searching for models for the future, and our economic system and democratic ideals appeal to them.

In September, when the Colombian rock star Juanes came to Havana, by some estimates as many as a million

people came to hear the concert. From the stage, he looked out at the Cuban people and started a simple chant: *Una Sola Familia Cubana*. The crowd roared approval at the thought of ending the conflict between Cubans across the Florida Straits.

There is a hunger out there among the Cuban people. America should capitalize on it. They want contact with their own families, and they want contact with American people and American ideas.

There is no other country in the world to which we have closed our lives as long as we have to Cuba. The Berlin Wall fell 20 years ago, but the wall separating Americans and Cubans has yet to come down.

We have a choice to ignore change and resist it or to mold it and channel it into a new set of policies. After 50 years of trying to isolate and destroy, it's time to try working with the Cuban people and making a new future together.

#### REMEMBERING SENATOR PAULA HAWKINS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the passing of Paula Hawkins, a former colleague of mine in the U.S. Senate and a very dear and close personal friend whose service to the Nation and her home State of Florida will endure for generations in the heads and hearts of her posterity, friends and legions of admirers.

In the ranks of those who greatly admire and will dearly miss Paula, I stand front and center today to salute this extraordinary woman for her accomplishments, outstanding public service, wonderful family and exemplary life. As I do so, I am humbled by the magnitude of the task. It is not easy to find the right words to do justice to such a unique and choice individual.

That said, I guess the first thing that comes to mind about Paula Hawkins is that, true to her Utah Mormon heritage, she was a pioneer—a real trail-blazer who opened doors and windows of opportunity for others to follow.

Long before there was a KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, OLYMPIA SNOWE or MARIA CANTWELL in the U.S. Senate, there was Paula Hawkins. In 1980, she became the first woman elected to that august body for a full term without the benefit of family connections, and she was the first woman from Florida to serve as a Senator.

And to the surprise of no one who knew her, she was no shrinking violet in Washington once she arrived. The media may have dismissively billed her as that "housewife from Maitland," but she quickly showed everyone that this was one tough homemaker who was acclimated to the political kitchen and could weather the heat that goes with it. I mean to tell you she was tough.

Anyone who knows Paula also knows that she was always impeccably

dressed. Indeed, her appearance was so picture-perfect that she probably made many a Hollywood starlet feel shabby by comparison. To say she was dressed to the nines is like saying Jack Nicklaus was a fair golfer or that Shakespeare sort of had a way with words.

But Paula was more than a pretty face. Sure, she had perfectly coiffed hair and wore designer clothes and jewelry, but she had a razor-sharp mind to go with her smart appearance, and she quickly showed she was nobody's pushover. She could stand toe to toe and verbally slug it out with some of the most powerful and even most obnoxious Senators. In other words, she gave more than she got—and her opponents, more often than not, got more than they bargained for.

She was a great debater, a human dynamo who brought unrivaled energy and unbridled enthusiasm to the Senate. She was extremely intelligent and tremendously interested in politics—and she was very good at it. A quick look at her successful Senate campaign in 1980 attests to just how good she was.

By today's big-bucks standards, Paula's campaign was strictly bargain-basement. Fox News pundit Dick Morris, her pollster at the time, recalls the campaign being too cash-strapped to afford a teleprompter. Aides made do by writing scripts on paper towels and unrolling them as Paula spoke. In the end, her powers of persuasion and command of the facts carried the day with voters.

After stirring voters' hearts in Florida, Paula stirred things up in the Nation's Capital. Change was in the wind when she blew into wintry Washington in January 1981. For starters, she became the first Senator to bring her husband to Washington, which resulted in the Senate wives' club being renamed the Senate spouses' club. She helped spearhead legislation to help widows and women divorcees get back into the job market. She supported efforts to improve pensions for women and make them more equal to that of men. She further fought to get daycare for the children of Senate employees. Even the all-male Senate gym was no sweat for Paula, who forced her fellow Senators to wear swimming suits so that she could swim there as well.

To me, Paula was a ray of Florida sunshine that brightened my days during the years we served together in the Senate. She was a true blue conservative who was warm, witty and cracked wise. We shared many a joke and a laugh along with our commonly held moral, ethical and religious beliefs. And we became political allies and fast friends. In fact, Paula became and always remained one of my closest friends.

Both on and off Capitol Hill, she always could be counted on through good times and bad. I quickly learned that her word was her bond. Whenever I needed help, she was always there. And