

From: wade locke <[l.locke@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:l.locke@[REDACTED])>
Date: October 6, 2018 at 9:56:51 AM NDT
To: <barrylearmonth@musktratfallsinquiry.ca>, <kateobrien@musktratfallsinquiry.ca>
Cc: <[l.locke@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:l.locke@[REDACTED])>
Subject: FW: Memorial Presents

Mr. Learmonth and MS O'Brien

When I explain to the inquiry about why I presented the information through the Harris Centre, I would like to reference this email trail if I could please.

Thank you

Wade Locke

From: Locke, Wade [<mailto:wlocke@mun.ca>]
Sent: October-06-18 9:53 AM
To: [l.locke@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:l.locke@[REDACTED])
Subject: FW: Memorial Presents

From: Locke, Wade
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2017 11:58 AM
To: [paddydaly.daly@\[REDACTED\]](mailto:paddydaly.daly@[REDACTED])
Subject: FW: Memorial Presents

FYI

wade

From: wade locke [<mailto:w.locke@mun.ca>]
Sent: October-10-17 6:39 AM
To: Locke, Wade
Subject: FW: Memorial Presents

From: Clair, Michael [<mailto:mclair@mun.ca>]
Sent: December-01-11 1:59 PM
To: Wade Locke; Wade Locke (Aliant)
Cc: Vardy, David; May, Doug; Greenwood, Robert
Subject: RE: Memorial Presents

Hi, folks! While I somewhat disagree with David's assessment of what he would bring to discussion, I respect his decision and thank him for having awakened Wade from his dogmatic slumbers.

Wade, I firmly believe that this is a session very much worth having and hope that you will agree to keep with it. My initial reaction is to provide you with the full hour to make your presentation, and then solicit questions from the audience – much as we did with your session on equalization a few years ago. I'm sure the complexities of the Lower Churchill project are such that you could easily take an hour to dissect it and clarify it for the audience.

In any event, I look forward to hearing from you once you've had a chance to sleep on it.

Mike

From: Wade Locke [<mailto:wlocke@mun.ca>]
Sent: December-01-11 12:45 PM
To: Vardy, David; 'Wade Locke (Aliant)'
Cc: Clair, Michael; May, Doug
Subject: RE: Memorial Presents

Mike and Doug

Given David's decision, I want to take the weekend to think about what should be done vis-à-vis the Memorial presents session.

I will prepare a paper and I will get back to both Mike and Doug on Tuesday to discuss further about whether a public session is worth doing.

Cheers

wade

From: Vardy, David [<mailto:dvardy@mun.ca>]
Sent: Thursday, December 01, 2011 12:20 PM
To: Wade Locke; Wade Locke (Aliant)
Cc: Michael Clair; Doug May
Subject: Memorial Presents

Wade

Upon reflection I have come to the conclusion that it would be foolhardy of me to enter into a "debate" with you on Muskrat Falls. I know what my limitations are and I have to operate within them. I am no energy economist. You are an energy economist at the "top of his game." My "best before" date as an economist is long past.

At the risk of losing some dignity, I must acknowledge that I am not the right person to debate this issue with you and that I must withdraw. I regret that this inescapable conclusion was not blindingly obvious to me when we first met to discuss it. Sorry for any inconvenience.

I am pleased that you have agreed to do a Memorial Presents on Muskrat Falls. I think that this will promote the kind of public discussion we all want to take place.

I am copying this note to Mike and Doug.

Cheers

Dave

This electronic communication is governed by the terms and conditions at http://www.mun.ca/cc/policies/electronic_communications_disclaimer_2011.php

This electronic communication is governed by the terms and conditions at http://www.mun.ca/cc/policies/electronic_communications_disclaimer_2011.php

This electronic communication is governed by the terms and conditions at http://www.mun.ca/cc/policies/electronic_communications_disclaimer_2011.php