

wane, and that his apprehension was ill-founded. There was in fact no move whatsoever in Ottawa to recall him for further questioning, and Pearson wrote reassuringly several times. He could not be reassured, however, and in his troubled state of mind he greatly exaggerated the ordeal which he had undergone in 1951-52. He was correctly informed that staff of the Senate subcommittee had been soliciting new evidence and reformulating old charges. William Rusher, deputy to Chief Counsel Morris, fully documented, in his book Special Counsel, the extent to which Norman had become a prime target, along with Pearson. In discussing the suicide, Rusher wrote, "... Norman had been my enemy, and the enemy of all who love freedom" (213). He also wrote that "A blow at Norman was, willy-nilly, a blow at Pearson." (198)

Norman agreed with that statement but not because Pearson might, as suggested by Barros, be exposed as "Moscow's ultimate mole," or even "an unconscious agent." (201) Rather it was because he had induced Pearson to understate his (Norman's) Communist activity at Cambridge; the Tories under Diefenbaker, and the media, would exploit to the hilt any discrepancy between Pearson's strong defence and the emerging truth. Recalling the ugly Parliamentary mood in 1957, and the Diefenbaker-Pearson feud, Norman was probably right, although his fear that the Government might be brought down was exaggerated.

In the longest of five suicide notes, Norman wrote of his "consciousness of sin", and yet he insisted upon his "innocence on the central issue." "At a moment like this," he added, "... I would freely confess any breach of security made by me ..." He requested the forgiveness of the Department which "is too well aware of my error - but crime no - that I have not committed." This appears to be a reiteration of his claim to have kept his oath of secrecy, but to have failed to be fully candid about his Communist past, thus creating difficulty for himself, his colleagues and his Minister. A man less sensitive, and less proud, could easily have braved it out. But Norman was not an ordinary person, either in his talent or in his vulnerability.

Nothing in what Norman said, or wrote in his suicide notes, suggests that he was afraid of important new revelations. Indeed, he said he was reassured by the awful thoroughness of the 1970-2 interrogations. He was worried, however, by the way the Senate subcommittee would "obscure and twist" the evidence, and he realised that there might be testimony that he had been virtually a Communist in his Cambridge undergraduate days. And he wished now that Pearson had not been so categorical and vulnerable in defending him.