

inspect all their military sites. The Obama administration said we will inspect their military sites. So you have a material disagreement on this JCPOA, this Iran nuclear deal.

We said that sanctions were going to be phased in over time based on compliance. The Iranian regime said sanctions relief was going to be immediate, no suspension. But why are we not holding Iran to their word on the ways that they are violating the letter of the JCPOA?

Why is it that before implementation day when inspectors, the last time they got to Parchin and they found particles in the soil that are consistent with nuclear capability, and then after we discover those particles the Iranians say, "That is it. No more access to Parchin," why are we not saying that Iran is not following their commitments under the JCPOA? This is the letter of the JCPOA.

Now, it would be great if we can have a discussion here about what the verification regime is. I would love to read the deal between the IAEA and Iran. When I was at a House Foreign Affairs Committee hearing with then-Secretary of State John Kerry and I wanted to engage with him, have a conversation about what the verification agreement was, I was shocked that even he said that he hadn't read the verification regime between the IAEA and Iran. It really makes you scratch your head.

I asked the question here on the House floor last Congress while we were debating the JCPOA. President Obama says that we are entering into the JCPOA not based on trust, but based on verification. So the question that I posed then, and I still haven't gotten an answer today, is: How do you support a deal based on verification without knowing what the verification is?

We are propping up the wrong regime. In 2009, during the Green Revolution, an undemocratic election, millions of Iranians went to the streets. These are people who go to the streets that right now there are people—millions of Iranians today—who would love a free, stable, democratic Iran. After an undemocratic election, they went to the streets. We said that it was none of our business.

Fast-forward years later, we are paying ransom of \$400 million that was disputed for good reason for decades, claims going both ways. There is a reason why that money wasn't paid out. There was a dispute, multiple claims, U.S. to Iran and Iran to the United States, and \$1.3 billion of interest. They said that it wasn't a ransom. \$1.7 billion in cold, hard cash in pallets that had to get delivered at the exact same moment of the American hostages—by the way, not all of them—at the exact same moment of the American hostages being released, and we are saying that that is not ransom.

That was a coincidence that we are signing documents in the middle of

January on the same exact day within 24 hours of each other.

Now, after we provided a jackpot of sanctions relief in exchange for this very one-sided deal, there was an election. After that election in Iran, members of the American media and around the world said that this was evidence of progress in Iran that the most moderate candidates were elected.

But do you know what that completely ignores? The 12,000 most moderate candidates not being allowed access to the ballot. We are propping up the wrong regime.

After our American sailors were detained, held hostage, and embarrassed in videos and photography all around the world, we said, "Thank you." That was our response, "Thank you."

After all the concessions that were made as part of the JCPOA, our Secretary of State became president for the Tehran Chamber of Commerce, and here we are. Fast-forward to today, and everyone who wants to see this President fail will stand with Iran before they would stand with the United States. They will ignore Iran's violating the spirit of the JCPOA. They will turn a blind eye with their head in the sand over Iran's violating the letter of the JCPOA.

Mr. Speaker, we gathered here this evening to talk about the President's correct decision to decertify the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear agreement, and to talk about the need to eliminate Iran's very problematic nuclear and nonnuclear activities. We heard from a half dozen other Members of Congress: Congressman JOE WILSON of South Carolina's 2nd Congressional District, DAVID KUSTOFF of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, Congressman TED YOHIO of Florida's 3rd Congressional District, Congresswoman CLAUDIA TENNEY of New York's 22nd Congressional District, Congressman ANDY BARR of Kentucky's 6th Congressional District, and Congressman TODD ROKITA of Indiana's 4th Congressional District. I thank them, and I thank all of my colleagues for their leadership on this issue.

There is important work ahead. There really should be more Members on both sides of the aisle working together on behalf of the American people putting country first on this issue.

People since the election pledged to entirely oppose and obstruct this President on everything and anything. While the President's hand was on the Bible, the streets of the parade route were lined up with people holding up signs that said "impeach him now"—while his hand was on the Bible.

□ 1945

Last November, Americans all around this country elected a President whose hand was on the Bible, yet people are calling for his impeachment just for the fact he got elected. Every day we are here, we have Members who come to the floor doing whatever they can in any way that day, that minute, to try to tear the President down.

I had disagreements with President Obama, but he was my President. We disagreed on the Iran nuclear deal. That is okay. We can disagree. We should disagree with President Trump, President Obama, President Bush before that, when we have strong philosophical differences on policy. That is what we are elected to do. We are not elected to all just come here and agree with each other.

But for those who are so set politically on trying to bring this President down, so much so that they will take Iran's side in this over the United States' side, I encourage you to rethink that and put country over party, because we need to work together as colleagues representing the greatest country in the world on a better path forward.

It is a privilege for all of us to be able to serve here in the United States Capitol in the United States Congress, because there is so much history on this floor. There is going to be much debate ahead on what challenges lie ahead for us with regard to Iran.

With servicemembers in harm's way, we understand and we reflect that that is what is most important. We should never send our troops into harm's way unless they are sent to win. We send our troops to win, or we do not send them at all. When they come home, they are treated with the love, dignity, and respect that they deserve on behalf of a very grateful nation; and with a strong, consistent foreign policy and taking care of our vets and setting up our military for success. It is having the right foreign policy with challenges that are in front of us in the Middle East and elsewhere.

That is why we are here for this Special Order hour in support of the President's decision to decertify the Iran nuclear deal. Mr. President, you made the right decision. We stand with you. We stand with the United States. We want to hold Iran accountable. We want the best path forward for our great country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: AMERICAN IDEALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to speak. I want to start by saying that my colleague from North Carolina is here, and I know there is going to be a group of Members from North Carolina who are coming to address their constituents. So if you are a North Carolinian looking in on this, you have come to the right place, but you are going to have to hear me first. I am speaking on behalf of the Progressive Caucus.

I don't know if Representative ZELDIN is still in the room. I couldn't quite resist the opportunity to respond to his provocative remarks where he said that it appears there are people in Congress who are so determined to take the President down.

I couldn't really figure out who he was talking about. Then I realized he is probably referring to Republican Senator JOHN MCCAIN from Arizona, or maybe Republican Senator JEFF FLAKE from Arizona, or maybe Republican Senator BOB CORKER from Tennessee, all of whom have blown the whistle this week on the egregious violations of the basic norms of the Presidency by this President, who continues to demonize and vilify U.S. citizens and engage in the pettiest and most juvenile of exchanges with people and generally demonstrate what most Americans now regard as his unfitness for the Presidency.

So it seems like there was an attempt to make it a partisan issue. I think if he has got a partisan problem with what someone is saying about the President, he needs to talk to members of his own party who are the ones who are screaming the loudest about the outrageous excesses and abuses coming from the White House today.

That is not what I came here to talk about, Mr. Speaker. I just thought it was a little bit beyond my humanity to endure that lecture, especially about impeachment, when the Representative comes from a party that impeached President Clinton over one lie—one lie about sex—and we get a profusion of dozens of lies every single day from the White House, from this President, about matters of public policy, crucial matters of national security, and so on.

That is not even to get into the question of admitted obstruction of justice, bragging about the fact that he had fired the FBI Director because he was involved in the Russia investigation; not even talking about the rampant abuse of power that we see as recent as this week with apparently corrupt dealings in terms of the Puerto Rican rescue, when 80 percent of the island is still without power, and it looks like there are all sorts of sweetheart contracts that are afoot there.

It is not even to go to the question of the domestic Emoluments Clause and the foreign Emoluments Clause, which are defied every single day with the money that is pouring forth from foreign governments directly to the Trump Hotel and Trump Tower and the Trump golf courses all over the world.

I am not going to get into any of that stuff because I want to talk about something hopeful and uplifting tonight. I want to talk about America's responsibilities in the world, something that we used to take really seriously.

I want to talk about what America is and who we are and what debt of responsibility we owe to the rest of the world and how well we are doing today, given what is taking place around the world.

Now, in America, unlike most countries in the world—or at least a lot of countries in the world—we are not defined by virtue of being one race or one ethnicity or one religion or one political party or one system of belief. We are unified just by virtue of the fact that we have one Constitution and one Bill of Rights. We all agree to adhere to it and live under it and struggle for a more perfect union under that umbrella.

Mr. Speaker, every day we get to come to work, and we see the busts and the statues and the portraits of great Americans. We see Frederick Douglass, we see Thomas Jefferson, we see John Adams, we see George Washington.

Mr. Speaker, America was the first Nation on Earth conceived in revolutionary insurgency against a monarchy, an arbitrary political leadership, and the fusion of church and State.

Our forebearers rebelled against centuries of religious warfare between the Catholics and the Protestants every bit as vicious and bloody as what we see in the Muslim world today between the Sunni and the Shia. They rebelled against the idea that, as Tom Payne put it, the king is law. He said that in the democracies, law would be king.

That was the idea behind America. We would govern ourselves. As Jefferson put in the Declaration of Independence, all men are created equal, all of us are endowed with inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—and government is legitimately erected only on the basis of the consent of the governed.

Now I hasten to say that all of those beautiful ideals were not realized at the start of our Nation. Let's not make-believe. Let's not pretend.

We didn't start, in the words of that great Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, as a nation of the people, by the people, and for the people. We started as a slave Republic of White male property owners over the age of 21, where the vast majority of people could not vote and could not participate: indentured servants, slaves, women, and so on.

But still, the idea was there, and those beautiful, tantalizing ideals were inserted by Thomas Jefferson, whose memory was defended recently by a group of hardy and defiant University of Virginia students who surrounded the statue of Thomas Jefferson to defend it against the rampaging mob of racist skinheads and Klansmen who had come to desecrate the memory of Jefferson and everything that he believed in with his ideals and the words that he put in the Declaration of Independence.

Those were the founding ideals of the country, and through successive waves of political and social struggle and constitutional change, we have opened America up. Through the Civil War and the Reconstruction amendments, we opened America up:

The 14th Amendment gave us equal protection and due process. The 13th

Amendment abolished slavery. The 15th Amendment said no discrimination on the basis of race in voting. The 17th Amendment shifted the mode of election from the State legislatures to the people. The 19th Amendment gave us woman suffrage. The 23rd Amendment said people here in the District of Columbia could participate in Presidential elections. The 24th Amendment abolished poll taxes. The 26th Amendment lowered the age of voting to 18 all across the whole country.

The whole trajectory of our constitutional development has been towards greater equality and freedom for the American people. That is who we are. We are a nation that united with other nations around the world to defeat fascism, Nazism, Stalinism, communism, and totalitarianism in the last century. We did that.

We stood with Eleanor Roosevelt and the United Nations in proclaiming the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which enshrined the rights of freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom of assembly, and freedom of the press, taking all those rights and freedoms that we fought for in America that are in our Constitution and trying to make them a global ideal so that all of the people of the world could enjoy the fruits and the experience of liberal democracy.

When we stood at our best as a country, we have been on the side of freedom movements. We have been on the side of human rights. We have been on the side of victims of government authoritarianism and persecution. That is who we are as a country.

It is all being forgotten and frittered away with the chaos that has descended not just upon the White House—that is too easy, I would say to my dear friend Mr. ZELDIN—on this institution, on lots of institutions in Washington, D.C. We are forgetting who we are.

Tom Payne said America was a nation conceived as a haven of refuge for people fleeing from religious and political persecution from all over the world. That is why our great symbol has been the Statue of Liberty and not a 14th century wall and barbed wire. That is not the real symbol of America.

Now, we are living in a time of rising authoritarianism and tyranny all over the world, from Russia to Saudi Arabia to Hungary to the Philippines to Venezuela. You name it. Authoritarian states everywhere are cracking down on free speech and free press, jailing enemies of the states and journalists, persecuting citizens for their religious beliefs and denying the essential human rights that are encoded in our national DNA, in our Constitution, and in the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

While the White House and this administration have abandoned U.S. leadership for human rights, the governments of the world are stepping up their authoritarianism. In Burma, in

Myanmar, the government is waging brutal ethnic and religious violence against Rohingya Muslims, thousands of whom have been killed and more than 100,000 of whom have fled the country, in terror.

Now, this savage campaign of ethnic cleansing in Burma by the Buddhist-led government is being turned on all Muslims in that country. And what is our government doing? Nothing.

In Turkey, which I will have a little bit more to say about in a moment, there is a vicious crackdown on free speech and free press, and the jailing of journalists and citizens without due process. In Russia, there continues to be outrageous human rights abuses against the personal political enemies of Vladimir Putin; against the LGBT community, which continues to be reviled and demonized by the government. In Chechnya, there are campaigns against journalists, and so on. In the Philippines, President Duterte has overseen the killing of thousands of people in a brutal war on drugs, with no due process at all, where the police can simply declare that you look like a drug user, you look like a drug dealer, and then they can have you killed.

It is also in Venezuela, where Maduro has consolidated his power and is denying the rule of law at every turn; in Saudi Arabia; in Iran, which was mentioned before, with brutal campaigns against ethnic minorities—one of the leading administrators of capital punishment on Earth, fomenting terror abroad.

□ 2000

Saudi Arabia, which Freedom House calls among the worst of the worst, where torture is present, where women are victims of almost pervasive sex discrimination—I think just a couple of months ago they won a limited right to drive in 2017—and on and on.

And across the world, governments have passed laws against blasphemy, against heresy, against apostasy, against witchcraft, against sorcery, against all kinds of imaginary religious offenses which were wiped off of the books of our State laws centuries ago under the First Amendment, and yet there are people rotting in jail today because they belong to the wrong religious group and they are accused of blasphemy or apostasy in Iran or in Saudi Arabia or Bangladesh, or any other number of countries which use the tools of the state to oppress people because of their religious faith and their religious worship.

What does President Trump do? Well, he personally praised Rodrigo Duterte in the Philippines and invited him to come to America. His first state visit was to Saudi Arabia, where he publicly said that he was not going to take issue with anything that they were doing in terms of human rights, didn't speak about any of the people rotting in jail in Saudi Arabia in a way that completely violates the human rights understandings and norms of the world.

He has praised Erdogan in Turkey. And, of course, we know of his infamous and somewhat inscrutable relationship with Vladimir Putin, certainly has nothing to say about human rights violations taking place against Russians, tens of thousands of whom have summoned up the courage since the President took office to march in the streets against political corruption and for human rights. And our government does nothing to support the people in civil society in Russia who are trying to stand up for the idea of human rights in their country.

Trump says, when he goes to Saudi Arabia: We are not here to lecture. We must seek partners, not perfection.

And he has found those partners all over the world: Duterte in the Philippines, Putin in Russia, Orban in Hungary. On and on down the list, you find a despot, you find a tyrant, you find a kleptocrat and a bully, you have found a newfound buddy of the United States of America.

Now, over the summer, media outlets reported that the State Department wanted to drop the promotion of democracy and human rights from the Department's mission. The State Department has since eliminated the www.humanrights.gov website and moved its content to an alternative and more obscure web address.

In May of 2017, Secretary of State Tillerson reversed decades of bipartisan consensus that human rights and democracy are not only essential components of U.S. foreign policy and national security, but universal values that the U.S. has adopted as a guiding principle of international legitimacy. And, of course, everyone knows of President Trump's attempts to withdraw from treaties and agreements all over the world, including, of course, the Paris accord on climate change.

Now, all of these actions, all of these statements are a betrayal of who we are as a country. We are not defined by race. We are not defined by ideology, unlike other countries around the world. We are not defined by religion. We are defined by an idea of liberal democracy committed to equality and freedom for all. If we give that up and we surrender that, we surrender what is most precious and defining about the United States of America, Mr. Speaker.

And guess what. We have got human rights problems right here at home that we need to be dealing with.

Do you know we have millions of Americans who can't vote and are not represented in Congress? This anomaly was brought home to us in a very sharp way over the last several weeks with the crisis in Puerto Rico, where people still lack access to medicines that they need, where people—a majority of the population still lacks access to clean water, and power is out for four-fifths of the population. Those are our people. Those are our citizens. Those are Americans in Puerto Rico.

But why were they treated differently? Why was there this notorious

negligence and lethargy in responding to the plight of people in Puerto Rico? Well, they have no voting representatives in this Chamber or in the United States Senate, so we have got millions of people unrepresented.

Right here in the Nation's Capital, in the District of Columbia, we see the exact same democratic deficit, the exact same discrepancy and discord between our values and our ideals and what the reality of daily practice is. We are the only democratic nation left on Earth where the people of the capital city are disenfranchised in their national legislature. We are the only one.

I have only been in this body for 10 months, Mr. Speaker, but I have noted how frequently and how joyfully this body will rise to trample the local legislation adopted by people in the District of Columbia who can't fight back because they don't have voting representation in Congress, and so we are very happy to kick them around if they have got a different point of view on death with dignity. Of course, death with dignity in the District of Columbia should be of no concern to us. What should be of concern is life with democracy in the District of Columbia if we are going to be faithful to our ideals.

They get to decide, not us. But as long as they are excluded from representation in the national legislature, they are going to continue to be kicked around on questions of gay rights and whether or not poor women can be given full access to reproductive healthcare in the District of Columbia, another issue where the majority in this body decided to squash the political self-determination of more than 650,000 American citizens who live right here in the Nation's Capital.

We have got millions of people who are disenfranchised. That is a human rights problem. So we have got to deal with that. Maybe if America begins to stand up again for human rights around the world, we will begin to stand up again for human rights in our own country.

So this is not a partisan issue. Of course, one of our great leaders in the advancement of human rights in America was President Abraham Lincoln, a great Republican, and his friend Frederick Douglass, a great Republican. I take pride in that. I take pride in the Republicans who fought for freedom and democracy in America. They are as much a part of my legacy as great Democrats like Franklin D. Roosevelt or President Barack Obama, the people who fought for civil rights and civil liberties in my party. So we should cherish everybody in our history who moved forward the engines of freedom and democratic change in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say these are tough times in America. There is a lot of chaos that has descended upon our country, and, Mr. Speaker, we need all Americans to know, but especially young Americans to know, what we really stand for.

We have a claim, a very strong claim to being the greatest nation on Earth, and it has got nothing to do with the military, and it has got nothing to do with our GDP. It has got to do with the way we were created, what our founding ideals were, and then the commitment of the people always to try to realize those ideals and engender a more perfect Union as we go along.

Let's keep America moving in that direction so we will continue to be a beacon of light to oppressed people all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GENERAL BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to recognize the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina on the occasion of its 150th anniversary. The story of this great Baptist convention is a testament to its founders, Reverends William Warrick, Edward Eagles, C. Johnson, L.W. Boone, B.B. Spicer, H. Grimes, John Washington, Charles Bryant, Sutton Davis, and R.H. Harper, the visionary men who founded the convention on October 18, 1867.

Since its founding, Mr. Speaker, great men and great women have maintained the convention's strength and viability. The General Baptist State Convention is the oldest convention of African-American Baptists in the United States of America. The General Baptist State Convention consists of more than 500,000 Baptist believers belonging to more than 1,400 churches, including my home church, the Jackson Chapel First Missionary Baptist Church of Wilson.

The convention is subdivided into 58 associations, each presided over by a moderator. Over the last 150 years, the convention has been led by well-trained and spirit-led theologians. The current president and executive board chair is my friend Dr. Nilous M. Avery, II, of Salisbury, North Carolina. He is the 32nd president of the convention.

Mr. Speaker, the current officers of the convention are: First Vice President At Large, Dr. Leonzo Lynch; First Vice President, Dr. Ricky Banks; Second Vice President, Dr. J. Vincent Terry, Sr.; Third Vice President, Reverend O.D. Sykes; Fourth Vice President, Reverend Prince R. Rivers; Recording Secretary, Reverend Curtis O. Donald; Assistant Recording Secretary, Reverend Matthew Rouse, III; Statistician, Dr. Nathan Scovens; Parliamentarian, Reverend Reginald Wells. The

Historian is Dr. Harry L. White, and the hardworking Executive Secretary-Treasurer is Dr. Haywood T. Gray.

Mr. Speaker, the Black church in North Carolina did not begin at the end of slavery. It became more pronounced and more transparent at slavery's end, but it existed for many years. It existed for many years prior to the end of slavery.

In 1831, the North Carolina General Assembly passed a law making it a crime for any free person of color or slave to preach or exhort in public, or in any manner officiate as a preacher or a teacher in any prayer meeting or other association for worship where slaves of different families were collected together.

Can you imagine?

The punishment for preaching the gospel—beginning in 1831, it was a crime. The punishment for violation was a whipping of up to 39 lashes on the bare back.

Notwithstanding this prohibition against preaching, the Black church existed as a secret association of slaves who worshipped privately. As the antebellum period proceeded, a few of the White churches, at the urging of the North Carolina Baptist State Convention, finally allowed people of color to hold church meetings under the supervision of a White person; and, at times, a member of the White race would conduct the service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Emancipation Proclamation was signed on January 1, 1863, and the 13th Amendment ratified on December 6, 1865, there were 4 million slaves who obtained their freedom; 300,000 of those lived in North Carolina. The former slaves, with assistance from White northerners and the Freedmen's Bureau, began the struggle toward freedom and equality. It was the Black church that led the way. This movement consisted of Black Baptist leaders and Black Methodist leaders and other religious leaders, both Black and White, who understood the importance of the former slaves having the ability to worship and serve their God without fear.

□ 2015

At the end of the Civil War, the former slaves built churches throughout North Carolina. Many were of the Baptist denomination, and they were erected with lightning speed.

In 1867, they came together, Mr. Speaker, at First African Baptist Church in Goldsboro, North Carolina. And I have a picture of it on display. They came together at the First African Baptist Church in Goldsboro to form the General Association of Colored Baptists of North Carolina, which was the original name for the convention. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that my grandfather, Reverend Fred Davis, would, in 1916, become the fourth pastor of this church.

Not only did Black Baptists build churches, but one of their greatest

achievements was the establishment and maintenance of historic Shaw University in Raleigh, which will be discussed by my colleagues, Congressman DAVID PRICE and Congresswoman ALMA ADAMS, in just a moment. Shaw University's contribution to African-American empowerment must be known and understood by all North Carolinians.

Those pioneers, who were trained at Shaw University, went into communities and established institutions and engaged in professions that empowered future generations. They went to all corners of our State. They went to eastern North Carolina; Piedmont, North Carolina; Triad; and the Federal area, which is where our esteemed sergeant at arms grew up in, Ms. Hamlett. Ms. Joyce Hamlett grew up in the Federal area. There were many other areas that were covered by graduates from Shaw University.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to include in the RECORD a list of names of African-American physicians, dentists, pharmacists, lawyers, ministers, and teachers who were also trained at Shaw University.

PRESIDENTS OF THE GENERAL BAPTIST STATE CONVENTION OF NORTH CAROLINA (1867–2018)

William Warrick 1867–1869
A. B. Williams 1869–1872
E. Eagles 1872–1874
L. W. Boone 1874–1875
Joseph Baysmore 1875–1876
Caesar Johnson 1876–1882
Joshua Perry 1882–1884
Caesar Johnson 1884–1885
N. F. Roberts 1885–1889
A. W. Pegues 1889–1895
C. S. Brown 1895–1897
Augustus Shepard 1897–1911
B. D. Griffin 1911–1918
O. S. Bullock 1918–1924
J. S. Brown 1924–1928
R. R. Cartwright 1928–1932
J. T. Hairston 1932–1940
P. A. Bishop 1940–1958
W. H. Davidson 1958–1959
R. M. Pitts 1959–1964
John W. White 1964–1970
Chancy R. Edwards 1970–1974
Joy J. Johnson 1974–1978
John R. Manley 1978–1982
E. Burns Turner 1982–1986
J. B. Humphrey 1986–1990
Willie B. Lewis 1990–1994
Clifford A. Jones, Sr. 1994–1998
John D. Fuller, Sr. 1998–2002
Charles T. Bullock 2002–2006
Gregory K. Moss, Sr. 2006–2010
Howard W. Parker, Jr. 2010–2014
Nilous M. Avery, II 2014–2018

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), a former Bennett College professor.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 150th anniversary of the General Baptist State Convention of North Carolina and join my colleagues, Congressman BUTTERFIELD and Congressman PRICE, in congratulating them on their achievements and the appointment of their 32nd president, Dr. Avery.

In North Carolina, the convention partners with Shaw University, the