visiting the communities in order to hold hearings but we do want members of this House to have a chance to question Mr. Justice Berger on how he arrived at his conclusions. We do want the chance to question the NEB on how they arrived at the conclusions in their report. And we do want to hear from Dean Lysyk on how he arrived at his conclusions. That is why we want a committee. It will give members of the House with interests in energy and in northern and Indian affairs an opportunity to discuss the question before it is debated in the House.

● (1410)

If the President of the Privy Council can twist the Prime Minister's arm that is, if he ever comes back to Canada—and get him to make that concession, then he will have gone a long way.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: Hon. gentlemen opposite are very touchy. Once one criticizes the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) they get all upset. Perhaps there are going to be more cabinet promotions for those who are the most upset at anyone criticizing the Prime Minister.

The government should support our ethereal amendment if the Speaker finds that it is in order. The President of the Privy Council kindly referred to my motion on Tuesday. I did not know that I had any influence on this government whatever, but it has now been acknowledged that the motion that I moved on Tuesday is now the government's policy. I am delighted to have them steal my ideas.

An hon. Member: And you did not have to walk across the floor to do it either.

Mr. Crosbie: No, I did not have to join the cabinet to have that happen. The President of the Privy Council said he thought that the official opposition should have moved a motion to cut the NDP off at the pass. Why should we prevent the NDP from cutting their own throats? The sooner they cut them, the better. They certainly cut them today. Has anyone ever seen a more foolish motion than the motion of the leader of the NDP? His motion was premature, pre-historic, and hysteric. His mind was made up pre-Berger. His mind was made up before a pipeline was ever suggested. His mind was made up on this issue 30 years ago. It does not matter who is going to make a report.

On February 23 the NDP moved a motion. Did they have copies of Mr. Justice Berger's report on February 23, or are they so omniscient that they knew what he was going to propose? Are we to expect that they are supernatural beings? I do not think so, because they have shown that they have feet of clay, and that clay is going to bury them today.

Not only has the NDP come to the conclusion that there should be no pipeline, that it should not go down the Mackenzie Valley, despite the fact that Justice Berger made a positive recommendation that the route was all right but that he wanted there to be time to settle other matters first—not only have they cast aside the Mackenzie Valley and Delta route, but they have now decided that there should be an Alcan pipeline. What kind of supermen do we have? Before Dean Lysyk even makes his report the leader of the NDP has come to the conclusion that the Alcan route is the route the pipeline should take, from Alaska down through the Yukon, into B.C. and Alberta, and on to the United States. I marvelled when I heard these hon. gentlemen make such a quick decision before the report is even in.

The leader of the NDP said that so long as financial guarantees are not required the Alcan route is the one that should be adopted. He wants three months more for the Lysyk committee to report. Why does he want this time? He has made up his mind that we do not need the Lysyk inquiry. The leader of the NDP has made himself a laughing stock, as anyone who reads today's *Hansard* and reads the premature conclusions he has come to will concede.

The Leader of the Opposition does not need the National Energy Board. If he ever becomes Prime Minister he will eliminate the National Energy Board.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: If any hon. gentlemen want the floor, they can speak after me.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. The hon. gentleman for St. John's West was recognized, and if anyone wishes to participate in the debate or interject, they must address their remarks to the Chair, or raise a point of order. But they must first be recognized.

Mr. Cullen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not know whether the hon. member for St. John's West was getting carried away with his own rhetoric, but he suggested that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Clark) would do away with the National Energy Board. I believe he meant to say the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Broadbent).

Mr. Crosbie: I am glad to have that correction, Mr. Speaker. The leader of the NDP would do away with the NEB because he has already found that we have sufficient gas supplies without using frontier gas to last us till the 1990's. What a piece of puffery. We all remember the three monkeys, Mr. Speaker: they see no evil, they hear no evil, and they speak no evil. The leader of the NDP sees no pipeline, he hears no pipeline, and he speaks no pipeline. The poor fellow, we have to pity him. That is the position of the NDP. I hope our ethereal motion will come before the House so we have something we can get our teeth into.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Crosbie: I can see they do not like that, Mr. Speaker. Let them all shout and bawl, but they will not out-shout me.

The position taken by the Leader of the Opposition today was entirely consistent with the position that he took on Monday, the position he took a month ago and five months ago, when he said that Justice Berger's report was excellent,