

has not yet received a scientific report from you on your findings. Naturally, we are all very interested in the results of your investigation and look forward to receiving your full report as soon as possible.

In the meantime, however, there have been some recent developments which, if anything, have only served to add further mystery to the metal and I am therefore writing to you in the hope that you may be in a position to throw some light on certain aspects of the situation. In September last, I received a letter from Mr. Arthur H. Matthews of Lac Beauport, Quebec, a co-worker of our group, requesting permission to test the mass of metal on site with what he described as a Tesla Bridge device. As we have always welcomed any scientific attempt to solve the mystery of this metal, we agreed to this and arrangements were made for Mr. Matthews to carry out this test on Sept. 28, during which a number of us were present. A few days later, I received Mr. Matthews' signed report in which he stated in effect that he had been requested to carry out this test by a person whose name he was not permitted to divulge and he concluded with the brief statement: "My study of this (test) on return to Quebec proves without any doubt it is a man-made form of iron and is without any doubt composed of earth-found ores. This piece of metal was never in space. Further test to prove my statement can be found if the complete block is applied to a reverberatory furnace. Please do not add any remarks to this statement which is final and complete."

As a scientist yourself, I am sure you will be the first to appreciate that this bald statement, with no scientific or technical details to support it, was far from satisfactory to our group who found the report unacceptable in its present form. At the request of interested parties, I wrote to Mr. Matthews asking if he could make a fuller statement giving some scientific explanation as to how he arrived at these conclusions, and in particular, raising the following 3 questions: (1) What was the actual composition and percentage of the various metals found in the chunk? This information is required in order that your data may be compared with the analyses which have already been carried out on the metal by professional metallurgists unaware of its background. (2) What is your explanation as to the origin of the inclusions on the outer surface of the metal which were believed to be micrometeorites? (3) What scientific method did you use to determine that the mass was never in space? This is considered far more important than the actual composition of the metal as it is possible that other planets may have the same minerals as Earth.

In reply, I received a letter from Mr. Matthews dated Nov. 7, 1969, in which he stated briefly: "I have referred your request re my findings on the metal to the Federal Authority who requested the test, as these findings are confidential." As you have, among your other duties, the official responsibility for investigating UFO reports and related matters, we could only assume that the "Federal Authority" referred to in Mr. Matthews' letter must be yourself, Dr. Millman, but to get the record straight, I would appreciate it if you would kindly confirm or deny this assumption.

More recently, I have learned indirectly that you have advised Mr. Brian Cannon of Winnipeg to the effect that you are satisfied there is nothing unusual about the metal and that in your opinion, it is manganese steel, apparently being ladle residue from the Sorel Foundry which inserts a pipe into their waste molten metal for lifting purposes and the pipe leaves a hole after solidification. Again, it would be appreciated if you could confirm that this statement is correct. If it is, then this information is,