

pages of evidence had been accumulated. No other standing committee had spawned such an active and controversial sub-committee²⁵ but, in so doing, it had overextended itself. No longer was debate confined to inter party wrangling. Both the Liberals and the Conservatives saw latent internal ideological differences come to the forefront. The Liberals seemed, at least at the committee stage, to be more successful at keeping it under control. For the Conservatives it opened up for public view deep divisions between the Right Wing and the Red Tory elements. Each group competed to have their way by stacking the membership in their favour. Finally, some of their foreign affairs stalwarts had to be removed from the committee and a pacifier brought in. Never before had a committee of the House so carefully debated, clause by clause, a report from its own sub-committee. The division continued to the end and resulted in not a consensus report but several dissenting positions being put forward as well.

At the time, some members thought that they would have a direct impact on policy but it soon became evident that members were no more united than foreign policy specialists on what attitude Canada should adopt on events taking place in Central America. They were disappointed that the Government took 20 months to reply to their report.²⁶ More important in the long term was what the hearings did for parliament and parliamentarians. Interested domestic constituencies now recognized the sub-committee as a forum before which they could obtain a respectful hearing. Foreign policy was suddenly an active political issue and members had more invitations to speak than they could handle. Lobbyists flooded their leader's offices with requests to carry on the sub-committee's hearings beyond the time that had originally been allotted. Members discovered that they could get some mileage out of their committee work. They also became the focus of attention for certain foreign embassies who were following their deliberations more closely than in the past. If there was some scepticism about what Canada could and could not do in the region, there was certainly none about what the sub-committee could do. Most members realized that there