

In fact, the alleged in-between was Hazen Sise, a representative in the Embassy of the National Film Board. He was never charged but it is possible he had picked up a few tid-bits from "Mike" in corridor talk, or in meetings of the Embassy staff; Pearson made an art of convincing others that they were hearing precious, inside information, when he never really gave a thing away. Bentley couldn't recall exactly what Sise had brought her, and she had soon dropped him on the grounds that he was having marital problems and seeing a psychiatrist. Assuming Bentley was telling the truth, the "secrets" she obtained could not have been all that great!

The Bentley testimony was a treat, however, for Prime Minister John Diefenbaker who, according to Barros, could only have received his copy from the President or the Secretary of State. (IP March/April 1989) John English, who has examined the copy in the Diefenbaker papers, concluded that the source was most likely "a Canadian journalist with Washington connections." Diefenbaker frequently brought it out for gullible visitors as proof of Pearson's Communistic leaning; in one of the ugliest encounters in Canadian history, he raised it as his response to Pearson's inquiry about Diefenbaker's knowledge of the Munsinger espionage affair. "Mutual blackmail" is the way the exchange has been aptly described. Pearson challenged Diefenbaker to publish the testimony. He had already challenged the State Department to do so. Neither took him up, but it can now be read in the John English biography, along with some interesting background (303-310).

Guy Burgess

This Soviet agent was a Cambridge contemporary of Norman's and the two may well have been acquainted. That the relationship was close, as Barros implies (13), is highly unlikely. Even more unlikely is the Barros claim that the two kept in touch after graduation (13). His only source is a letter he shows as having been received from a British author, Richard Deacon. When I phoned Deacon, he requested a day to check his notes, and then reported that he had no evidence that the two men had been close at Cambridge, and none that they had communicated after graduation.

Norman himself said only that he knew who Burgess was, and did not approve of what he had heard about his life style. He did take part in a march organized by Burgess, but did not mention his name in his letters or testimony about the march. Barros is just guessing when he writes that Burgess "no doubt, had asked [Norman] to participate." (13) "No doubt", a favorite Barros phrase, generally indicates ample doubt, and no evidence.