

I am certain that there was no significant gap, and no blockbuster lurking in a hidden file. There is simply too much continuity, overlapping and cross-referencing in what I saw. Even more reassuring are the frequent reviews of the key documents, and in-house discussion of the significance of the evidence. Too many officials were and are involved to permit the possibility of an elaborate, decades long conspiracy to hide crucial evidence, and to what purpose? Successive governments of both parties have made statements that are limited but, post-Pearson, they have been consistent and true. One of Diefenbaker's early acts was to call for the complete Norman file. Obviously he found nothing in them that could further damage Norman or Pearson.

Norman had entered External in 1939 without a security check. Had he received one, he would never have been accepted. Serious clearances were introduced in 1946, but Norman was abroad and had still not been cleared when disturbing information about him came to light in 1950. External rushed him home and, with the collaboration of the RCMP, subjected him to a six-week examination. Skepticism, especially in the RCMP, remained about his past associations, and seemingly poor memory, but no evidence was ever found of his being a spy, or an agent of influence. That indeed has been, to this day, the clear conclusion of every weighing of the Norman evidence within External, the RCMP and now CSIS. The most intensive study, one which took place eleven years after the suicide, produced the most impressive affirmation that there is simply no proof of treason.

There are reports of friction between the police and External, and some are probably true. Barros seems convinced that External was able to bully or hoodwink the RCMP into writing a letter to the FBI in November 1950 that seriously misrepresented its own position. (see Appendix B 11) John Sawatsky, in a good account of RCMP-External relations, reports that there were cheers in RCMP headquarters when the news came in of Norman's suicide. (145)

The Norman files, however, and consultation about the case with several senior officials, both retired and serving, present a reassuring picture. Of course External hoped to retain one of its most talented officers, one whose conduct had been impeccable for over a decade. Of course they knew that morale in the Department would suffer if Norman were dismissed, especially if it seemed to be under American pressure. But it is also clear that Norman would have been dismissed had there been anything but "guilt by earlier association" evidence. It was External's right and duty to make the decision, and both it and the RCMP had reservations about Norman's friends and judgment. But the RCMP did nothing to resist External's