

Later he admitted that the subcommittee staff created the document. After that, he wrote a letter of apology to Nan Aron.

It is still unclear which staff actually participated in this deception and what authorization they received from Members. Concerns have also been raised that staff of a member's personal office performed functions which should have been under the direction of subcommittee staff.

Mr. Speaker, some have said in defense of the subcommittee that the forged document with the Alliance for Justice letterhead was merely a harmless graphic which was intended to illustrate the majority's contention that some member organizations of the Alliance received Federal funds.

But if this was merely a harmless graphic, then one of its purposes was to give the impression that there was something improper or illegal in their receipt of Federal funds.

Mr. Speaker, this was an exercise in using an official investigative hearing of a House subcommittee to deceive, rather than to enlighten.

The House and its committees cannot function if Members of the House attempt to deceive each other, as well as the press and the public which we represent, with false information.

The resolution submitted by Ms. SLAUGHTER called for the Speaker to get to the bottom of this incident. The Speaker had already acted earlier to ensure that Members of the House must take responsibility for documents circulated on the floor about pending legislation and amendments.

We still need action to ensure that the integrity of the committee process is respected so that its principal purpose—to gather accurate information which we can use to write legislation and to conduct proper oversight—is respected.

That integrity has been under attack throughout this Congress, not just in the incident we are addressing today.

For example, at the recent Waco hearings jointly conducted by subcommittees of the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, we discovered that representatives of a private entity, the National Rifle Association, were treated like professional committee staff of the House; that an attempt was made to allow them access to confidential materials which might be used as evidence in the hearings; and that there was an effort to cover up their role.

As the majority must now realize, those revelations, as well as the incident involving the forged document, were counterproductive. They interfered with whatever message the majority might have been trying to put out. They embarrassed the committees and Members involved. Ultimately, they reflect on the House and on all of us.

Mr. Speaker, we often disagree on policy. But let's not attempt to deceive each other, or the national audience

outside the House, with forged documents, tricks, and misrepresentations. That hurts the House on every legislative issue, not just this one. And that is what the House must speak firmly against. This must not happen again.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. If I could just ask the gentlewoman a question. I know you have seen the press release that was handed out saying that the House voted to vindicate the gentleman involved.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I did.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Did you notice that that was written on committee stationery?

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. No, I did not.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the leadership of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] in this committee in trying at least to uphold the laws of the House, but the laxity, as you had pointed out, what we have seen in the Waco hearings and what we saw the other day in the hearings on the White House Travel Office, indicate to me that integrity is in very short supply on that committee.

I wonder if you agree with me, and you were there the day this document came about. I have said many times I think the thing that saddened me most was the fact that the staff and the subcommittee chair thought it was very amusing, and they saw nothing in the world wrong with what had taken place here.

I feel that it is going to be my obligation. If no one else of the 435 Members care about it, it is terribly important to me that this not take place here in this House. This is too sacred a ground that we stand on. Too many people send us here with their total trust that we are going to do the right thing. I can imagine their outrage if they really knew that this is going on. Frankly, I do not know how much more of it goes on. But at least on this piece right here where I was closely involved I intend to make my stand.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the efforts of the gentlewoman from New York to bring a serious problem to this body's attention. The actions of majority staff of the Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs are very disturbing, and every Member of this House should be alarmed. The entire House is once again subject to more public outrage about our activities by the production of a phony press release concocted just to make a point.

When the Republican leadership immediately tabled the gentlewoman's resolution yesterday, it certainly sent a strong message to me. Why has the Republican leadership gagged us? Why can't we have a debate? As the gentlewoman has pointed out, quite correctly, forgery is a crime. This matter needs to be examined to ensure that it never happens again. Contrary to arguments from the other side of the aisle, this is not merely a partisan issue: it is a question of institutional integrity.

I was encouraged at the beginning of this Congress when the new leadership promised that the House would be more open and that debate would be free. What has happened to

that promise? I opposed efforts in the last Congress to gag or shorten debate, and I still oppose these restrictions. To say I am extremely disappointed in what happened here yesterday would be an understatement.

This is a serious problem that casts a dark shadow over this institution. So why have the Republicans also attempted to discredit the gentlewoman from New York? We all received a Dear Colleague from the Republican members of the subcommittee that not only attacked the integrity of the gentlewoman from New York but also evaded the facts. Perhaps it is because the gentlewoman is correct: forgery is a crime. This matter needs to be examined to ensure that it never happens again. Regarding the integrity of the gentlewoman, I wonder how many signers of this Dear Colleague have received campaign contributions from Defense corporations? We don't see the Republicans attempting to subvert the first amendment rights of Defense and other corporations who engage in lobbying activities.

I also question the fact that this was just a simple mistake. If the intent was only to show the amount of Federal dollars received by the Alliance for Justice, why was it necessary to use House Information Resources to produce an exact duplicate of the Alliance's letterhead, even down to its e-mail address?

The legislation that produced this controversy, the restriction of groups from using any of their own funds to lobby, deserved to be debated in a very open forum. I do not see how this is possible now. The fact that the majority staff of this subcommittee believed it necessary to willfully falsify a document to make a point about the need for this legislation certainly sends a unmistakable signal that they and their superiors did not have enough facts to bolster their arguments.

I hope the matter does not end here. Regardless of the propriety or impropriety of the actions by majority staff, the fact remains that the information was false and could have become part of the public record.

Finally, how can we explain this to our constituents? As we all know, the public's perception of Congress is still quite low. This sad situation will only lower our constituents' opinion of both the process and the institution most of us respect. This is the greatest tragedy of all, because it undermines every Member's mission—producing sound and reasoned laws for the public good. How can I tell my constituents back home that I am making the best decisions on important issues when the information I am receiving may be either skewed or fraudulent?

Once again, I salute the gentlewoman's commitment to this serious problem.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized to control the balance of the pending hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, could I just inquire, does that mean that I have 5 minutes or that I have how long?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has a maximum of 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the Speaker and I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the balance of her time.

CYPRUS

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about the Budget Reconciliation Act that we passed today. But before I do that, if I could just spend a couple of minutes on a matter that is very important relating to the state of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, Earlier today Cyprus's Minister of Foreign Affairs met with the International Relations Committee for a briefing on the United Nation's and United State's continuing efforts to bring about a peaceful resolution to the illegal occupation of Cyprus by Turkey, which is now in its 21st year. I am, consequently, here tonight to once again lend my support to Mr. Michaelides and all of the Cypriot people in their fight to restore independence to their country.

Mr. Speaker, over the last two decades the international community has demanded that the Turks—who today manage their illegal occupation with a heavily armed force of over 30,000 troops and 300 tanks—allow the Cypriot people to live as a free and independent people in various forms over the years. Most recently, in July of last year the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 939, which mandated that any settlement of the Cyprus issue must be based on a state of Cyprus with a single sovereignty and international personality and a single citizenship with its independence and territorial integrity safeguarded.

During this time period the United States has also repeatedly urged Turkey to abide by the various United Nations resolutions that have been issued. Just a few weeks ago on September 18, the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 42, which insists that all parties to the dispute regarding Cyprus agree to seek a solution based upon the relevant United Nations resolutions. House Concurrent Resolution 42 also urges the Turks to build upon a gesture of goodwill made last year by Cyprus's President Glafcos Clerides and agree to remove all foreign troops from the island.

For 21 years the entire region surrounding Cyprus has been in a volatile state, casting a pall of instability that feeds the specter of war. The Secretary General of the United Nation has called Cyprus one of the most highly militarized areas in the world. As an international champion for both the notion of self-determination and respect for international law, the United States has an obligation to make sure that when the Foreign Minister leaves our country, he will leave knowing that American people fully support the demilitarization of the island as part of the larger effort to secure a free and wholly independent Cyprus.

As I said when I spoke in support of House Congressional Resolution 42 last month, a Turkish refusal to act on this proposal can only be read as an unwav-

ering determination by Turkey to ignore the rule of law. Indeed, the Secretary General of the United Nations has also noted there has been a lack of progress on this issue due essentially to the lack of political will on the Turkish Cypriot side. There is, however, no shortage of American political will when it comes to assisting Cyprus in its struggle for independence. Indeed, as the House's decision earlier this year to cut United States aid to Turkey demonstrated, there is an ample supply of American political will, and the sooner the Turks realize it, the better it will be for them, for Cyprus, and for the maintenance of international peace.

1945

Mr. Speaker, I would like to now turn, if I could, back to the legislation that we spent most of our time on today, and that is the budget reconciliation bill.

When I had a few minutes during the debate today to talk about why I was opposed to Speaker GINGRICH'S budget reconciliation plan, I made reference to something that I rarely make reference to because I do not really think that surveys or polls are necessarily a good indication of the way people think. But in the poll that was actually done by the New York Times and CBS News that was in the New York Times today, there was reflected essentially what I have been hearing from my constituents relative to the budget, relative to the purported tax cuts and relative to the changes that the Republican leadership is making in both Medicare and Medicaid in this budget bill that was passed today.

Essentially, what the New York Times poll showed was that the public in general feels that and Medicare Medicaid are going to be seriously diminished for the worse as a result of this Republican bill that passed today, also that the tax cuts really are a sham, that they essentially go mostly for the rich and that ultimately this Budget Reconciliation Act, which is purported to have the purpose of balancing the budget, will not accomplish that goal.

I mention those things because I think that essentially they are true. They not only reflect what my constituents say but they reflect the reality of the legislation that was passed today.

If you look at the whole idea of balancing the budget, why would you start out with a tax cut? We all know that, in terms of the revenue that comes in, it is not sufficient to balance the budget. So if the revenue is reduced, and particularly if it is reduced in order to give some cuts to mostly wealthy people, then the balancing of the budget is going to be more difficult, and that is, in fact, what happens with this Republican proposal.

After 7 years, the national debt will be at least 250, some estimates even higher, because of the tax cut, and if you look at the tax cut, it provides

more generous benefits at higher income levels.

We know that the legislation actually would raise taxes on those earning less than \$30,000. So it is not even a tax cut unless you are making more than \$30,000.

We are asking the American people to implement this tax cut mostly for wealthy people and at the same time that we are raising taxes on those below \$30,000. And what are we doing it for? Well, I mean, if you look at what has been the debate for the last week or so on the House floor, you know that what is happening in this bill is that Medicare and Medicaid, Medicare being the health care program for the elderly, Medicaid being the health care program for low-income people, are both being seriously diminished, some would argue ultimately abolished, because of this budget bill.

It is no surprise, really, over and over again today on the House floor, and I will repeat it again, we made mention, the Democrats did, at least, to the Senate majority leader, BOB DOLE, Speaker GINGRICH, and the statements that they made with regard to the Medicare program. We know that from the very beginning, when Medicare was passed back in the 1960's, that most of the Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate actually opposed it. And Senator DOLE, who is actually running for president now, was one of the 12 Members of Congress who voted again the Medicare bill at that time back in the 1960's.

Well, again, this Tuesday, earlier this week, he reiterated in a speech before the American Conservative Union, "I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, one out of 12, because we knew it would not work in 1965." What a message that is being sent here by a candidate for President of the United States. He is essentially saying Medicare is a terrible program, and certainly it is no surprise that he and the Republican leadership are trying to essentially gut Medicare today.

Speaker GINGRICH went even further, in a sense. He pointed out that maybe we are not abolishing Medicare today, but that is ultimately what will happen. He says, "Now, we don't get rid of it in round 1, because we don't think that that is politically smart, and we don't think that is the right way to go through a transition period, but we believe it is going to wither on the vine because we think people are voluntarily going to leave it."

So what he is saying, in a sense, is he is saying very straightforwardly to, I think it was, to an insurance group, and this was actually today, that, "Well, we may not be totally destroying Medicare today, but the changes are so radical that it ultimately will disappear," and that is exactly what is going to happen under this legislation.

In an effort to try to achieve tax cuts mostly for wealthy people, not to balance the budget, we are destroying both Medicare, and I would argue also

Medicaid. At least now, though, the Republican leaders are saying that they never liked Medicare from the beginning and that that really is what they are trying to do, get rid of Medicare.

How do they get rid of Medicare? Well, basically, what they do is they squeeze the program in Medicare and Medicaid so much. In other words, they take so much money out of it and they set limits on the amount of Federal dollars that are actually going to be available over the next few years so that it is not possible essentially to operate Medicare and Medicaid the way we have known them.

They also increase taxes on Medicare recipients, on the senior citizens who are part of the Medicare program. They doubling the Part B premium. Part B is the program that pays for physicians care. It could go from something like \$40 today to something like \$90 over the next 7 years. They means-test Medicare Part B for the elderly; those who have higher incomes will have to pay more.

But most importantly, what they are doing here, and this is why the Speaker says that ultimately people will get out of Medicare and it will disappear, is because they make it so difficult to stay in the traditional Medicare program where you choose your own doctor and he gets reimbursed in what we call a traditional fee-for-service program. So little money goes to that traditional system where you choose your own doctor and Medicare reimburses it, most of the increased dollars that are going to be available or most of the dollars that are going to be available go to HMO's or managed care systems. So if you decide you do not want to choose your own doctor and you want to go to a HMO, you are encouraged to do, because more money is going to be available on that side for seniors who go into HMO's or managed care than for seniors who stay in the traditional fee-for-service system where they choose their own doctors. That is how they get to the situation where the Speaker says ultimately Medicare disappears because more and more people will not be able to take advantage of the traditional Medicare.

On Medicaid, the abolition of Medicaid is even more direct under the bill. Medicaid right now is an entitlement, which means that if you are eligible because of your income, you get the health insurance benefit. But instead of providing a continued entitlement, we estimate maybe 35 million or so Americans who take advantage of Medicaid all of a sudden now their future and their ability to get health care is left up to the States. The money that the Federal Government provides, which again is capped and is limited, goes to the States in a block grant and the States decide who they want to cover, how they want to cover, and when they want to cover those individuals, and so essentially they could decide that they do not want to cover certain people or they could make it so

difficult for those people to become eligible and so little money would be available that essentially they do not have adequate health care.

The worst the examples of this are that, I think, for myself, and again where you can see a link between what is happening with Medicare and Medicaid, was brought out last week and again today on the House floor where we mentioned that right now part B Medicare recipients, these are senior citizens who want to have their physician services covered, if they are below a certain income, if they are eligible for Medicaid, Medicaid now pays for their Part B premium. That guarantee, which exists under current law, its abolished.

There are a lot, we estimate about 7 million, widows in this country who are low-income, who right now Medicaid pays for their Part B premium. They no longer have a guarantee anymore that Medicaid will pay for that.

Although the Speaker last week indicated that this bill, or either the Medicare or this reconciliation bill, would take care of those low-income seniors, the reality is that they are not covered under this legislation that passed today.

So I think that when the American public, based on that New York Times poll or based on what I hear from my constituents say, that they are very scared about the future of Medicare and Medicaid because of the legislation that was put forward by the Republican leadership and passed rather narrowly today almost on a partisan vote, there is reason for them to be scared because the Republican leaders, because the leaders, whether it is Senator DOLE or Speaker GINGRICH, basically—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The Chair will caution Members not to make personal references to Members of the other body.

Mr. PALLONE. Oh, you mean the Senate? All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I forgot that I am not allowed to make personal references to Senate Members.

What I wanted to say, though, in conclusion, is that it is abundantly clear that the Republican leadership in both houses, both the Senate and the House of Representatives, essentially are not in favor of Medicare, certainly the Medicare that we know of, and so when seniors express their concern and say they are fearful that this bill is going to abolish or significantly change Medicare or Medicaid for the worse, they are certainly accurate in their concerns.

We have some time, though. We have some time because even though this bill passed today, it still has to pass in the Senate. President Clinton has said that he intends to veto the legislation, and the vote today, which was rather narrow, I think it was about 232 to 200, so there were over 200 Members who were opposed to it, I think will send a message to the administration that this is not a bill that should be supported and that it should be vetoed,

and when it is vetoed and it comes back to this body, we will join with all of those who have expressed concern about it to make sure that we can come up with a better bill that does not severely impact Medicare and Medicaid and that ultimately achieves the balanced budget that is necessary to achieve deficit reduction and get this country back on the road to economic prosperity.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have a quick question. I respect the gentleman a lot. I heard the very tail end of his comments.

Is the gentleman committing to support that compromise that you just described if we are able to work one out?

Mr. PALLONE. Oh, absolutely. You know, I guess I should point out to you today that I had a problem with the, some problems with the Democratic substitute that was proposed, and so I ultimately did not support it. But I think that, in general, what that substitute indicated was that it is possible to achieve a balanced budget in 7 years within the time frame that the bill that was passed today proposes and that you can achieve that without having the level of cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that this bill seeks.

One of the ways that the Democratic substitute achieved that was, of course, by eliminating the tax cut.

I think the bottom line is that it is possible to achieve deficit reduction to balance the budget within the 7 years. It certainly is a worthy goal, but you do not have to do it on the backs of America's seniors, which I think is what is happening.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have one simple question. I am curious if you would tell me, over the next several years, will the amount of money that we are going to spend on Medicare increase?

Mr. PALLONE. The amount of money that you propose to spend on Medicare would increase in absolute dollars, but what I would say to you is that the problem is that the rate of increase is insufficient to keep a quality health care system. I do not like to get involved in this debate over whether it is a cut or an increase. I think I will acknowledge that it is an increase in the actual amount of dollars, but if you look at the inflation rate and you look at the amount of money that is going to be necessary to keep a quality Medicare and Medicaid system, I think it is inadequate. That is my point.

Mr. NORWOOD. Well, I know you do, and those of us on this side really believe it is very adequate. For the first

time, we are going to give providers of health care the opportunities to help bring down that inflation rate, and I think we will see that happen.

□ 2001

“60 MINUTES” REPORT ON THE DEATH OF VINCE FOSTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 15 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have been watching the television show on CBS, “60 Minutes,” for a long, long time, and I have always respected that program because it was very informative, and I always thought it was factual. And then, just after the last presidential election, I think Mr. Hewlett, the producer of “60 Minutes,” said in a national interview that had he exposed all of the information that was available to him at “60 Minutes” during the campaign, that the then candidate for President, who was later elected, would be walking around in the snows of New Hampshire. So it became apparent to me that the “60 Minutes” producers and the people who ran that show had a very strong bias, and that bias was reflected in much of their reporting.

This became apparent to me again about 2 weeks ago on a Saturday night, when I watched Mike Wallace start doing a 20 minute segment on the death of Vince Foster. I have never seen so much misinformation and so much bias in reporting as I saw during that 20 minute segment.

Let me just tell you some of the things that happened, some of the things that “60 Minutes” ignored. Mike Wallace said that every government body that has investigated the death of Vince Foster reached the same conclusion, than he killed himself at Fort Marcy Park.

He did not mention that the independent counsel, Kenneth Starr, has reopened the investigation. Mr. Starr's attorney spent this summer questioning witnesses before a grand jury. The FBI is back in Fort Marcy Park, or was a couple of weeks ago, more than 2 years after Vince Foster's death, looking for the bullet that killed him. Would the independent counsel go through all of this work were there not unanswered questions about the case?

So I believe that Mr. Wallace was incorrect when he said that the conclusion has been reached by every government agency. In addition, many of us in Congress have come to different conclusions as well.

Another thing that he forgot to mention was that the police were not the first people to encounter Foster's body. He mentioned a national park policeman who found the body. The fact of the matter is that the park policeman did not find the body. The body was found by a man called C.W., the con-

fidential witness, who was the first person on the scene.

I have a sworn statement, where I went out to his home with a court reported and two other Congressmen, from the confidential witness. The FBI questioned him extensively and considers him honest and credible.

“60 Minutes” never talked about him or even mentioned on that program that there was a confidential witness that found the body. “60 Minutes” never read his statement.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], who is the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight in the House, told “60 Minutes” that he knows more about this subject than any Member of Congress, and, although I have high regard for Representative CLINGER, he never interviewed the confidential witness, although he had an opportunity to do so, and he never read his sworn deposition, which was verified.

Mike Wallace went into great detail during this interview about how the gun was found in Foster's right hand. He said critics of the investigation incorrectly stated that Foster was left-handed. Well, that misses the point entirely. When the confidential witness discovered the body, he looked very carefully. He was within 18 inches of Mr. Foster's face. He looked very carefully and saw no gun in either hand. He was very clear in his statement, in the sworn statement before me and the FBI, that when he found Foster, both hands were palm up with the thumbs pointed out away from the body. When the police arrived on the scene, they found his right hand palm down with the thumb pointed in, the gun on the trigger finger, and the gun was partially obscured by his hand and his leg.

When the confidential witness found the body, the head was looking straight up, and there were no bloodstains on his cheek. When the police arrived, the head was still pointing up, but there was a contact bloodstain on the cheek and the trails of blood running from his mouth and nostrils down the side of his face.

Now, how did Foster's hand get moved and why was there no gun in it when the man found it, and later there was a gun in it? How did Foster's head get moved? It is obvious to me that somebody was there and moved the body.

Now, the Park Police officer, Officer Fornshill, was not, as I said before, the first to discover the body. It was a confidential witness. Park Police Officer Kevin Fornshill told Mike Wallace that Foster's body could not have been moved to the park because the vegetation around him was not trampled.

But the fact of the matter is the confidential witness said in a sworn statement that the vegetation below the body, from the feet all the way down to a path that went all the way around the park, it was trampled flat. There was a narrow path at the bottom of the berm that winds around the perimeter of the park. “60 Minutes” would have

known this if they had read his statement, or even decided to look into it and asked.

The confidential witness told the FBI that he saw a half-empty wine cooler body near Foster's body. The Park Police did not find it. What happened to the wine cooler bottle and were there any fingerprints on it? As the confidential witness was leaving the park, he looked inside the white Nissan parked in the lot and saw a half-full package of wine cooler bottles, very similar to the one beside the body, a briefcase, and a suit jacket that looked similar to Foster's suit pants. This was not Foster's car. Foster's car was a gray Honda and it was parked further away, and C.W., the confidential witness, did not walk near it.

Mike Wallace made a big issue out of the amount of blood around the body. He interviewed the medical examiner, who said there was sufficient blood underneath the head and shoulders to conclude that he died at that spot.

This misses the key point. There would have been blood underneath Foster's head, whether he shot himself at the spot or was moved there. The key point is there was no blood spattered on anything behind where Foster was sitting. Anytime someone shoots himself through the mouth, there would be blood splattered all over above him, and there was nothing above him that had any blood on it whatsoever. The vegetation on the path behind Foster was clean.

The first emergency medical services person who arrived at the park, George Gonzalez, commented that it was very unusual for a suicide victim's body to be laid out so neatly, with the feet together and the hands neatly at his side. He told this to the staff of the Committee on Government Operations, and he said: “I find it odd to have the body laid out like it was. I wouldn't expect the hand or body in the position found, the hands perfectly at the side.” “60 Minutes,” incidentally, did not interview Mr. Gonzalez.

Mike Wallace noted that it was not unusual for Foster's clothes to have carpet fibers on them. Foster's attorney said that Mrs. Foster had just had new carpeting installed in their home. Well, if that is the case, why did the FBI not take carpet samples and match them with the fibers on his clothes? They did not do that.

There were blond hairs on Mr. Foster's body and all over his clothes. Why did the FBI not compare these hairs to the hair of the people Foster knew and was close to?

Here are some other keys points that “60 Minutes” left out in their biased reporting.

First, the Park Police investigation was incomplete and unprofessional. The photos of the crime scene were underexposed and did not turn out. The only photos were of very poor quality, and they were made with instamatic cameras.