

accused of taking government property. The article suggests that the truth of this story could be checked by comparing the Ottawa Chunk with the bridge relics. If these still exist, this is certainly another avenue of research which could be followed up. However, the article goes on to throw some very logical doubts on the veracity of the story and wisely leaves the case of the mystery metal open until more acceptable answers are forthcoming.

As a matter of record, Mr. Matthews propounded his Quebec Bridge theory to our group prior to making his test on the Chunk with the Tesla Bridge, a test which, as reported earlier, left some grave doubts in the minds of some of our technical workers who witnessed it, particularly as no scientific proof was forthcoming to support it, and most of them were unable to accept that it was possible to prove that the metal mass had never been in space with a device used primarily for detecting flaws in metal railway lines! It was also noted that the volume indicator on the tape recorder linked to the Tesla Bridge showed no signs of 'life'. Last summer, one of our readers visited Mr. Matthews who, during an interview, claimed he had worked on the Quebec Bridge - and immediately recognized the Chunk as part of it! In view of the fact that Mr. Matthews had seen photos of the Chunk a long time ago, one wonders why he kept silent about its origin for so long? In this reader's report to us, he stated that Matthews had admitted to him that the Government had asked him to check the metal in the hope that we would believe him, thereby confirming a suspicion we expressed in an earlier report.

As for the Quebec Bridge theory, our group analyzed it carefully but finally dismissed it as completely untenable and certainly no scientific proof of the origin of the metal, in fact, we considered this theory to be more incredible than the possibility of the Chunk coming from Outer Space! Let us briefly analyze the facts proffered by Mr. Matthews. We are told that in 1907, the scrap dealer illegally removed 2 large pieces of metal, weighing 3000 lbs. and 800 lbs. respectively, from the collapsed bridge site. This immediately raises a number of questions: How was he able to lift this heavy material without the use of a crane which could immediately attract attention? And even if he was successful in removing it thusly, why would he go to all this trouble if the only purpose was to tow this material 20 miles and then dump it on a beach near his home? Even more intriguing, how did he manage to place the larger chunk in a delicately balanced position on a rock, and for what purpose? Having gone to all these extraordinary lengths, are we then expected to believe that the 2 chunks of metal lay undetected and untouched on the beach for 53 years? And why, after over half a century had elapsed, did he suddenly decide to pick up the 800-lb. piece and sell it as scrap metal? This aspect of the case does not tally with the story of the local beach-comber interviewed by our group in June, 1960, who said that he had covered the beach pretty thoroughly the first week of June; then came 3 days of rain when he did not work the area, but when the weather cleared, he then found the 2 metal chunks on the beach. Now if we assume that the original scrap dealer was of the average age of 30 when he took the 2 metal chunks from the Quebec Bridge in 1907, we wind up with the ludicrous picture of a doddering old man of 83 finally picking up the 800-lb. piece of metal! With all due respect to Mr. Matthews, we must make allowance for the fact that he is now a very old man and therefore, in our search for the truth, we must apply a certain amount of scientific reservation to some of his statements.

Mr. Ronald Anstee, who has played an active role in the metal research since 1965, has sent us a copy of a letter he directed to the Editor of Canadian UFO Report in which he makes some strong comments on Mr. Matthews' Quebec Bridge story, extracts of which follow: "I was present with members of the Ottawa New Sciences Club when Mr. Matthews examined(?) the metal. His statements are, when taking into consideration the way in which the metal was found plus the state of the metal, idiotic. The metal mass is very dense and heavy, and very ragged. It is in layers, having apparently gone through intense heat and very severe impact. I have been used to hard work and exercise for the past 35 years, so I know that it was not easy to break off the few metal pieces I have. The shape (of the mass) is unusual and bears no heavy scarring as one would expect to find on metal that has been cut by acetylene torches. It originally weighed about 3,000 lbs. If it was ever part of an old bridge, then how many thousands of tons did the bridge weigh? When the