

this subject. It is well known why the Government chose to transfer that commitment from the north flank of Europe to the central region. There are many arguments that have been made for and against this move....The fact remains that there was a commitment...that Canada could not sustain adequately....Sustaining it once it was there meant that commitment really could not be upheld in a way that I, as Chief of Defence Staff, would consider militarily viable.¹²

During the same hearing, Mr. Robert Fowler, Assistant Deputy Minister for Policy in the Department of National Defence, also commented on Gen. Thériault's remarks. Responding to a query by Liberal MP Douglas Frith about the existence of a "Thériault Plan", Mr. Fowler stated:

I have not ... heard of anything called the "Thériault Plan." I have heard from General Thériault the kinds of views he expressed in [the press] article. He has expressed publicly a preference for having retained the CAST commitment to the north flank, perhaps, but not necessarily at the expense of the other European commitments. It is not quite clear whether he would have sacrificed all the other European commitments to doing that one right or not.¹³

In reply to Mr. Fowler's statement, Mr. Frith remarked that a Canadian General at SHAPE headquarters had indicated to him that Thériault's ideas had "gone beyond just talk."¹⁴

On 4 March 1988, Liberal Party Member Len Hopkins introduced a motion in the House concerning Canada's participation in, and support for, NATO. The motion read:

¹² SCND Proceedings, 28 March 1988, p. 6.

¹³ Ibid., p. 40.

¹⁴ Ibid..