newfoundland labrador hydro

Hydro Place. 500 Columbus Drive.
P.O. Box 12400. St. John's. NL
Canada A1B 4K7
t. 709.737.1400 f. 709.737.1800
www.nlh.nl.ca

October 29, 2026

VIA EMAIL

[redacted]

Re: Your request for access to information under Part II of the *Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, 2015 (File #: PB/1390/2026)

On October 1, 2026, we received your request for access to the following records/information:

All submissions made as part of the Churchill Falls Agreement questionnaire via EngageNL.

Please be advised that access to the records responsive to your request has been granted. Please see the Appendix A attached hereto. In keeping with our standard practice, it is our intention to post this letter on the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro website.

Please be advised that you may ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the processing of your access request, as set out in section 42 of **the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act, 2015** (the Act) (a copy of this section has been enclosed for your reference). A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the Commissioner.

The appeal may be addressed to the Information and Privacy Commissioner as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner
2 Canada Drive
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A
St. John's, NL. A1B 3V8

Telephone: (709) 729-6309
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309
Email: commissioner@oipc.nl.ca

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act (a copy of this section has been enclosed for your reference).

If you have any further questions, please contact me by telephone at (709) 733-5346 or by email at CassandraHearn@nlh.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Hearn

Cassandra Hearn
Access and Privacy Officer

Access or correction complaint

42. (1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52(1) or 53(1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to

(a) a request that is disregarded under section 21;

(b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23;

(c) a variation of a procedure under section 24; or

(d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26.

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.

Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant

52. (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16(2).

(3) Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant is notified of the commissioner's refusal under subsection 45(2).

Appendix A

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1	What company/province will be doing the hiring?
2	Will the current practice of providing Fermont power first during a Labrador West power outage be changed as Fermont currently gets any power before Labrador West?
3	Why will we still be paying three times as much for our electricity as Quebec? We use our resources to provide the product i.e., electricity and we get the short end of the stick.
4	How can it cost 25 billion dollars to run a power line to Labrador West when it didn't cost close to that for the inter-island link?
5	$49-BILLION VALUE: Will government publish the complete calculation supporting the claimed $49-billion value, including assumptions, sensitivities and how double-counting was avoided?
6	GULL ISLAND OWNERSHIP: Why does Hydro-Québec require 40% ownership of Gull Island while also initially purchasing most of its electricity?
7	What exactly does NL receive in return for that 40% equity?
8	NL-CONTROLLED ALTERNATIVE: Did government model an NL-controlled Gull Island alternative using federal loan guarantees/support, Labrador Indigenous equity, institutional investors, multiple long-term buyers and domestic industrial customers? If so, will that analysis be released?
9	$25-BILLION TRANSMISSION ESTIMATE: Minister Lloyd Parrott has said independent transmission could cost approximately $25 billion. What route, capacity, technology and assumptions produced that estimate, who prepared it, and will the engineering/economic study be released?
10	NL POWER NEEDS: What long-term electricity-load forecast determined how much Churchill River power NL should retain for mining, green steel, critical minerals, defence and other development versus export?
11	CPI AND FUTURE POWER VALUE: Annex F provides CPI-related protection, but CPI is not the same as the market value of firm clean electricity. What protects NL if electricity values materially outperform CPI over the next several decades?
12	Was a periodic market-value or upside-sharing mechanism considered?
13	985 MW MARKET ACCESS: Of the advertised 985 MW of market access, how much is firm physical transmission under NL control, how much is CHPE/NECEC-linked or synthetic market access, and can these rights expand later?
14	FINAL AGREEMENTS: Will the final Definitive Agreements be released before execution with enough time for independent legal, technical and financial review, and will government publish an independent fairness opinion?
15	GENERATIONAL WEALTH: If this agreement is expected to create generational wealth, is government considering a protected heritage or legacy fund, debt reduction and dedicated Labrador investment rather than treating all new revenue as ordinary annual government revenue?
16	REFERENDUM: Premier Wakeham promised a province-wide referendum before a final Churchill Falls agreement. Why has that commitment been replaced by a House debate and engageNL questionnaire, and will the referendum still be held before the final Definitive Agreements are executed?
17	What percentage of the true economic value of Churchill Falls after 2041 will Newfoundland and Labrador actually receive?
18	Is it possible to get a FREE Fibreoptic Corridor through Quebec placed in this agreement for a 'Future' AI Supercenter built in Labrador to feed North America?
19	Why does the existing Churchill Falls plant need another roughly 50-year power contract?
20	What happens if electricity becomes dramatically more valuable by 2041, 2050 or 2060?
21	Exactly how does the CPI mechanism work?
22	Can you give examples showing what NL receives under sustained inflation of 2%, 3%, 4%, 5% and 6%?
23	How much electricity will NL actually control for its own future development?
24	Has government calculated what that retained electricity could be worth if used inside Newfoundland and Labrador rather than sold e.g., feeding an AI Supercenter plus other Industries?
25	What exactly are the 985 MW of "transmission rights"?
26	Can you break down the distribution?
27	Where does the claimed $25-billion cost of independent transmission come from?
28	What does the "Discriminatory Action" provision actually prevent future NL governments from doing?
29	What is NL's maximum financial exposure to Gull Island?
30	Could Gull Island leave debt or unrecovered investment at the end of its PPA?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
31	Why is 2,700 MW the optimal size for Gull Island?
32	Who actually controls Gull Island?
33	What happens to NL electricity rates? Show what residential rates are projected to be in 2030, 2040, 2050 and beyond- with and without the Churchill developments.
34	What happens if Gull Island, CF2, wind or other proposed projects don't proceed?
35	What does NL give up by signing now rather than waiting until 2041?
36	What did the 2026 negotiations actually fix from the IRC report?
37	Why shouldn't the 2026 DCIA receive the same independent review that the 2024 MOU received?
38	Why the Hurry to sign-off this deal?
39	Why do the agreement terms dictate CPI as the means for price increases for our power and not market price?
40	I understand the agreement period is 50 years. Are there opportunities for review during that period and if so what terms can be renegotiated (i.e., price)?
41	Why can't we get them same rate for electricity that Quebec will get?
42	Why does this deal have to be for 60 years? This should be for a maximum of 25 with a review every 5 years.
43	Will Newfoundland and Labrador residents be getting cheaper electricity bills?
44	When is the referendum promised?
45	Why is Government signing a 50-year agreement and not a 25-year or less agreement?
46	With the end of the 1969 deal just around the corner why the rush? We have the resource and Quebec needs it!
47	Will there be a considerable decrease in kWh at some point?
48	What's the difference between this agreement and the one in 2024?
49	Does it include transmission to the island?
50	Is there a clause for Quebec Separation?
51	Are the profits going to the people of the province or in the pockets of the politicians and government employees?
52	Why is NL still going to pay a higher kWh rate than QC?
53	Why are we continuing to have such a kWh high rate? Ignore the rebate being implemented.
54	Why is NL gifting 40% of the equity and 84% of the capacity of Gull Island to Quebec?
55	Why are we using a pricing model that's based on cost-recovery rather than the market value of the power to be produced?
56	With the world, according to [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], on the verge of a power crisis, why is NL planning to transfer control of Gull Island to Quebec thereby ruling out any other options for developing the hydropower and thus the economic value of the river?
57	Why is the power purchase agreement for the existing Churchill Falls power plant not based on the market price of the energy being produced?
58	Why don't the arrangements for the Upper Churchill ensure that the value accruing to each shareholder equates to each owner's equity position?
59	Is it accurate that the 50-year term of the new Churchill Falls PPA is due to the fact that it's the minimum term that Quebec would accept?
60	Why are there seemingly no options for reopening the PPA particularly if circumstances result in power being sold in a few years for much lower than its market value?
61	Why is it so difficult for Quebec to pay market value for the energy that they are taking, particularly for any amount that exceeds their share based on their equity position?
62	Why doesn't the NL government take the time to objectively assess the revised MOU and communicate the outcome to the public?
63	Why is it so challenging for the government to do what many knowledgeable people feel is in the best long-term interest of the province?
64	My main concern is with where Churchill River power will fit into the Quebec Hydro stack. Will it be "first on, last off"? or "last on, first off"? This priority could mean the difference of BILLIONS of dollars! Churchill River power should have the same dispatch priority as the power from Le Grande River in Quebec at the very least. The agreement must have very strong language tying ALL power flowing through Quebec to current market values.
65	Would there be a possibility in the future when the province is in a better financial position, the provincial sales tax can be eliminated from our electricity bills?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
66	How is this a good deal for NL? Our rates are astronomical compared to Quebec. We deserve the same or lower rates than Quebec in this deal.
67	Can you itemize the annual projected "revenue to NL not CFLCO" from this deal starting in 2027 for the next 50 years so we can see where the specific years revenue can drastically improve our services?
68	Why are we not hiring experts in electricity generation, electricity forecasting and all other in house experts like Hydro-Québec has so we can actually negotiate a deal, rather than just accept the scraps they offer us?
69	Why are we in a rush to put this deal through without at least the same oversight you insisted on in the last MOU?
70	Why are there no reopener clauses on price for the 50-year duration?
71	Why aren't we getting the referendum we were promised last year?
72	We waited this long, what's another 15 years?
73	Do you actually think Hydro-Québec is going to walk away from an asset they own 35% of?
74	Their own projections for replacement cost have gone up 31% since 2024. Electricity isn't getting cheaper. Why not wait until 2041 when we control our resource?
75	How is this deal benefitting the average Newfoundlander, because I don't see it? A $350 rebate per year is insulting, especially when we see how the people of Quebec benefits. Just seems that all our rich resources never benefits the people.
76	I understand the plan to add additional capacity by adding additional generating facilities, however, without adding additional water to the reservoirs, I am not understanding how additional production will be added, excluding some efficiency improvements. Could you provide an explanation of these capacities?
77	Has NLHs Climate Change and Mitigation and Adaptation Committee analyzed the potential changes in water management?
78	Will any changes to chemical, biological or physical changes to water management be subject to environmental impact analysis and made public?
79	Why waste time sign up the deal?
80	Why are we not having a referendum as promised?
81	What are you planning to do to support the municipalities that will be directly impacted by this?
82	Will our power bills be significantly cheaper since the power is generated on home land?
83	Did Mark Carney have a say in this deal?
84	What are the behind the door conversations that the public don't know about for this deal?
85	Why aren't we getting cheaper power?
86	How do you think the working class or the working poor feel about electricity rates even with this new "15% rebate"?
87	Do you think electricity rates are too expensive for the average Joe?
88	Why do governments tend to use handouts for solutions when it's not fixing the root cause of the problem?
89	Why isn't there a referendum or did mark carney say no to that?
90	Why the 50-year deal it's too much no one can see that far into the future?
91	Why is our power rate more than Quebec's?
92	Why are you thinking about signing a new deal for 50 years?
93	Are there escalation and opt out clauses during the contract based on current energy prices?
94	What happens in "30" years when NL needs more power than we thought we would?
95	What is in it for me as an islander besides 350 dollars?
96	Why won't the Government listen to the people who want a referendum?
97	Also why do we need wind power?
98	Why are we giving away another resource like Churchill Falls and like the Bay du Nord?
99	So what's it going take people like me take away our most precious resource away to another Province or Country?
100	Why is there no referendum, Premier Wakeham said there would be one?
101	Why go for 50 years on another contract that cannot be changed?
102	Why is Quebec getting most of the power?
103	Why make a contract that only seems to support the notion of exporting power?
104	Why not have power stay in NL for business and industry?
105	What exactly will Labrador receive from this?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
106	I want details on expenditure on medical facilities, housing, policing, drug treatment, training, hydro to the coast, subsidized airfare. Why are you not keeping the existing CF project renewal separate?
107	Can you commit to not permitting this project to power data centres?
108	What are you doing to ensure the needs of Labradorians are met first?
109	What protection is put in place to ensure Labradorians are first place in line for jobs?
110	Muskrat hired more Newfoundlanders and let unions decide which of their friends got hired. How will you avoid this happening again?
111	Will you ensure this agreement removes penalties paid to Quebec from the existing CF agreement when power outages happen?
112	How does this MOU protect the people of NL in the event there is a dramatic rise in the market value of the power in future years?
113	How can we plan for more power from the Upper Churchill when units at the present power plant are being taken off line because of low water levels - a situation that will surely get worse with climate change?
114	How much of the projected revenue and future power requires considerable study, agreements and investment before they can proceed?
115	How can government ministers be so enthusiastic about this MOU when they admit publicly that they don't fully understand the agreement?
116	How can this government have any credibility when they blatantly reneged on one of their many promises in the last election to have a referendum on this MOU?
117	Will the Newfoundland and Labrador residents and consumers of electricity pay the same or lower rate for electricity as Quebec residents currently pay?
118	Why should anyone believe anything Wakeham and his Cons say after their blatant lie to give the citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador a say in this generational agreement with Quebec?
119	Why do this government feel the need to sign in for another 50 years?
120	Why, when we as a province own the water rights and resources, pay much more for electricity than Quebec and why wasn't that first to be changed during the negotiations?
121	Why so fast?
122	Will the cost of electricity to customers in NL be the same prices as customers in QC?
123	Will the Labrador boarder be clearly noted and respected by QC within this agreement?
124	Why must the MOU be commingled with other projects?
125	Why do you think the 1.8 cents per kWh is good considering power will be sold for 16 cents?
126	If this deal is so good, why will ratepayers still pay double the rate of Quebec ratepayers?
127	Recognizing that most new homes use considerable amounts of electricity, why is there a rebate cap discriminating against those that use much larger amounts of electricity?
128	Why is the new deal with Quebec so long, with no window to review and renegotiate?
129	Which province will prosper most financially, in the long run, from this new deal, NL or Quebec?
130	Why is the current government selling out NLs hydro resources to Quebec?
131	Why can't NL control its own hydro resources?
132	Will NL residents pay the same price for electricity as Quebec residents?
133	Why did the current government, who promised a referendum for the NL people on the "new deal", go back on its word?
134	Why are we agreeing to a long-term agreement, 51 years, when that was the cause of our problems with the 1st Churchill Falls contract in 1969.it makes absolutely no sense to sign another agreement without the benefits of being able to renegotiate the rate compensation? This new agreement should be no longer than 25 years and then be adjusted as per the current market rates of electricity. The current contract expires in 2041 and Churchill Falls power plant will still in operation so why would we not wait for current contract to expire and then negotiate on our terms as we own the majority shares in CFLCO.
135	Is there a built in automatic review mechanism if inflation or interest rates causes electricity rates to rise above 5%?
136	Does the money that we get from this deal increase as the price of electricity increases, also does the billion $ allow for increases?
137	A billion $ today isn't going to be worth the same in 50 years. Why 50 years, why not 25 or 30 years?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
138	Is there going to be a referendum on the new agreement as promised during the election campaign?
139	To give true value of this project to Newfoundland and Labrador residents we should never have to pay any more for electricity than Quebec residents. Why isn't this achievable?
140	Why lock into an agreement for 50 years?
141	Have we learned from the very first agreement that 50 years is way too long?
142	Why so little time to debate this in the house with only 45 minutes question period?
143	Will our power bills go down?
144	How come our electricity rates isn't lower to match Quebec rates?
145	How will the government fulfill its commitment to secure a better agreement for Newfoundland and Labrador?
146	Why are we only talking to Quebec?
147	Why are we rushing into a 50-year agreement rather than using a five-year term?
148	Are you not worried we will be taken again?
149	Referendum?
150	When and how will I get a response to my question?
151	When is the referendum?
152	What are the rates Quebec will be paying as opposed to NL?
153	What about the referendum so Newfoundland and Labrador could vote on the new agreement?
154	Why are we including Gull Island project into updating the 1969 Churchill Falls agreement?
155	How would this agreement benefit the people of Newfoundland and Labrador with regards to Hydro rates?
156	I realize that Quebec and Labrador are on Churchill Falls rather than Muskrat Falls but the difference between 6.4 per kilowatt hour for Quebec and 16.4 per kilowatt for Newfoundland is not acceptable. Instead of giving Quebec a deal why not all Newfoundlanders benefit for a deal where we sell our power for more and provide our people with the lower rates? Better still why not let the [LANGUAGE REDACTED] deal run out and see what Quebec has to do then?
157	Why must we tie ourselves to a 50-year contract?
158	Why can we not employ a panel who would be as impartial as possible to review the deal on our behalf?
159	Why is the government so invested in rushing this deal through?
160	Why won't you release the deal so that we can see it?
161	Why won't you honour your election PROMISE, and hold a referendum?
162	How much of that $49 billion is guaranteed cash revenue-and how much is simply projected economic benefit?
163	What are we actually getting per kilowatt-hour for Churchill Falls power, and how does that compare with what Quebec can make selling that same power?
164	If electricity prices rise faster than inflation, does Newfoundland and Labrador lose money because the deal's price increases are tied to CPI?
165	Can you guarantee that Newfoundland and Labrador can sell our power directly into the U.S. without Quebec controlling or taking a share of the transaction?
166	If Gull Island goes billions of dollars over budget, who pays-the province, Quebec, Ottawa, or Newfoundland and Labrador taxpayers?
167	How much new provincial debt will this deal create, and what is the maximum financial liability taxpayers could be left with?
168	How much of the electricity generated will actually be available for new industries and development here in Newfoundland and Labrador rather than being exported?
169	The government is promising cheaper electricity for residents. Is that reduction permanent, and what will residential power rates look like after the rebate ends?
170	How many permanent Newfoundland and Labrador jobs are guaranteed by this deal-and what happens if those commitments aren't met?
171	What did Newfoundland and Labrador have to give up to get this deal, and what safeguards are in place to make sure we don't find ourselves in another Churchill Falls situation 20 or 30 years from now?
172	If this really is the best deal Newfoundland and Labrador has ever received, will you commit to releasing the complete financial model-including every assumption, price, escalation clause, transmission cost and risk-so the public can independently verify the government's $49-billion claim?
173	In the new agreement what will be the kWh rate that Quebec will charge their residents?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
174	What hourly rate will NL charge their residents?
175	Why do NL'ers have to settle for paying more per kw hour than Hydro-Québec customers when the resources are in NL?
176	Why isn't the benefit to NL power customers more than $350 in savings per year?
177	Why was the escalator clause removed?
178	Was another point negotiated to protect NL from rising costs and inflation?
179	It is reported that this deal saves Quebec over 200 billion versus alternatives. Why didn't NL negotiate an upfront percentage of that to be paid immediately to NL or we wait til 2041?
180	What is the rush to sign now?
181	Why does the agreement have to be for 50 years?
182	Why wasn't the need to allow NL to transfer electricity across Quebec included in deal?
183	Why is the cost of Newfoundlander's electricity lowered by this deal?
184	Why is the gov not using outside agency to review deal like they did with previous MOU?
185	How is this actually going to help the individual Newfoundlander or Labradorian?
186	Based on the information shared on the premier's own Facebook page, this deal is slightly better in some areas and slightly worse in some areas why is being touted as the deal of a lifetime?
187	What is in this deal that puts NL in a better spot now than if we just waited for the original deal to run its course?
188	We should be paying less or equal to Quebec for hydro, why isn't this the case?
189	Why 50 years?
190	Why is our rate per kWh not dropping down to 5 or 6 cents?
191	Is there an escalation clause?
192	Why did we not get a lump sum up front?
193	How much control or ownership does Quebec and Government of Canada have on this resource?
194	I want to understand why the Newfoundland Government is committing to another 51 years contract with Quebec and why the referendum is not going ahead as promised by the current PC government?
195	I also don't understand why we can't do this on our own and why are we paying such high prices when Quebec are paying a fraction?
196	Why is Quebec going to have all the say on our provinces resources?
197	Under this new MOU agreement, will Newfoundlanders and Labradorians see their kWh rate on par with Quebec?
198	We need cheaper electricity rates per kWh as compared to that of Quebec. It's NL's electrical power, so why are we giving Quebec such a low rate for their kWh?
199	Will the agreement lower the consumer price of electricity to that paid by consumers in Quebec.to be specific: residential consumers in Montreal or Quebec city? If not then it is not a good deal.
200	Why has the clause regarding market-based pricing been removed?
201	Why is there no referendum which you promised there would be?
202	Why are Newfoundlanders still going to be paying double the power rates of Quebec?
203	For all new power (excluding legacy upper Churchill generation) from the Upper Churchill & potentially Gull Island, how does the escalator work. What will the initial base rate per kWh be & is the escalator tied directly to increases in power market pricing?
204	Please provide an example. E.g., start rate 6 cents per kWh for NL. Market sales prices rise by 4 cents per kWh. What will NL's new base rate be?
205	Why does the government believe that accepting a deal that sees most of the financial benefits going to Quebec is the right deal for NL?
206	Why does the government believe that a deal that only provides (limited and restrictive) inflation protection instead of market value protection is the right deal for NL?
207	Why does the government believe that breaking their promise of a referendum serves the best interests of the people of NL?
208	Why does the government believe that ignoring the advice of their independent review committee is in the best interests of the people of NL?
209	Why does the government believe that lowering the price of electricity to match that paid by Quebec residents is not in the best interests of the people of NL?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
210	Why is the government limiting the review time of an agreement that will last for 50 years to only 60 days and why do they believe this is in the best interests of the people of NL?
211	When will definitive agreements be signed?
212	How come we pay 16 cents a kWh And Quebec pays 8 cents?
213	Why is this deal for 50 years and not 25 years with mandatory 5-year adjustment reviews as is standard internationally for these types of large power agreements?
214	Why are we accepting an inflationary adjustment with a 0.8 deadband rather than a simple inflation clause tied to the CPI?
215	Why is this deal bundled with other developments in Labrador?
216	Can we not simply renegotiate the CF pricing and treat each other development separately?
217	Why is the contract so complex?
218	Can we not negotiate a simple agreement like the original one? For example, power sold at 50% of Quebec's self-stated replacement cost of.17 for a price of.085 per kWh, with escalators to adjust annually as energy prices increase and pegged to CPI. Anyone could understand these terms. Why can we not hold a referendum on the deal as promised?
219	Hold live streamed and televised information sessions leading up to the referendum and have a vote. Leaving out a referendum due to cost is like missing a meeting to raise your salary from $20/hour to $100/hour because it will cost $1000 to travel to the meeting. We have dropped the energy price adjustment in favor of an inflation adjustment. Does this not simply lock us into another 50 years of the same old pricing while ignoring fluctuations in energy markets?
220	Why can we not have prices rise with both energy markets and CPI?
221	Why will you not consult the same IRC that you put in place to assess the 2024 MOU, and make their assessment public?
222	Why are you signing a 50-year deal without revisions permitted?
223	25-year max is the industry standard. What are we giving Quebec more than 25% of the power for a resource that we own?
224	Why are we signing a deal that does not allow us to transmit as much power as we want to through Quebec to sell as we determine (not selling to Quebec for resale)?
225	Why are we selling to Quebec for less than market rates?
226	Why are we selling to Quebec to give them power for 1/3 of what they would pay to develop it elsewhere?
227	Why are you not holding a referendum as promised?
228	Why are you selling the deal to us instead of giving the facts clearly?
229	Why are you rushing to sign a deal on Quebec and now Ottawa's timeline?
230	Didn't we learn anything from Joey's 1969 deal?
231	Was there ever any consideration to dam the Humber River?
232	Whose genius idea was it to build wind turbines in Labrador when the northern peninsula has trees missing branches on one side due to the wind?
233	Has there ever been consideration into maybe not doing a deal with Quebec at all; it's because there's no one smart enough to handle it on the island, right?
234	Will you manage to hire some labradorians to work, or will we be trucking in Newfoundlanders by the bucketloads because there's no industry on the island?
235	Will Labrador benefit from any of this or will we continue to be pilfered by the island until every bit of our resources are gone?
236	Speaking of Quebec, Considering they want to truck their rare minerals across northern Labrador for processing, couldn't you guys try to hammer out a better deal for our "mighty" river?
237	Considering you take our iron ore to the island for processing from Voisey's Bay so more of your people can have jobs off the backs of Labrador, could Northern Labrador get a road so we don't pay for some detergent with our first born sons?
238	Can we get more than scraps for another mega contract in Labrador? What percentage of the economic benefit from the Lower Churchill development is projected to remain in Labrador, where the actual resource is located, and what percentage will accrue in Newfoundland. Please provide the answer in dollars, jobs, infrastructure investment, and long-term revenue rather than assurances that Labrador will benefit as part of the province.

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
239	Will any of this money filter down to the people in the form of provincial tax relief? 15 % is a deterrence for business and home purchase.
240	The government is calling this the "New Better Deal." Why is the 1969 Churchill Falls contract being used as the primary benchmark for evaluating the new deal?
241	Given how extraordinarily unfavourable that agreement was to Newfoundland and Labrador, shouldn't government also demonstrate how the DCIA compares with the actual market value of the power, the value of the underlying resource, and the economic value of the alternatives available to the province?
242	Is "better than 1969" really the standard government believes is sufficient for committing Churchill Falls power for another 51 years?
243	Why 51 years?
244	What specific economic, financing, or legal requirement makes a 51-year commitment necessary?
245	Why could the same objectives not be achieved through a shorter term, periodic repricing, reopeners, collars, or other mechanisms? The government has called this "Our Biggest Economic Opportunity Yet."
246	If government believes this is the best deal available, will it publish the analysis that demonstrates that conclusion? Specifically, will government release the underlying assumptions, models, discount rates, sensitivity analyses, and comparison with credible alternative scenarios?
247	What alternative scenarios were actually evaluated?
248	Did government compare the DCIA against continuing negotiations, retaining more Churchill Falls power for in-province development, greater exposure to future electricity markets, shorter-term agreements, or other possible structures? If so, what were the results of those comparisons?
249	Who independently reviewed the final deal?
250	Which economists, electricity-market specialists, engineers, financial experts, tax and regulatory specialists, and lawyers experienced in complex, long-term power agreements, who were not part of negotiating the agreement, independently reviewed the final terms and challenged the government's assumptions?
251	Why should the public accept a predetermined escalation path for 51 years when nobody can reliably predict the value of electricity even 10-20 years into the future?
252	What mechanisms in the agreement allow Newfoundland and Labrador to participate in the potential upside if the future value of firm, dispatchable renewable electricity substantially exceeds the assumptions built into the current pricing structure?
253	Does Exhibit C's "Discriminatory Action" clause restrict Newfoundland and Labrador's future ability to increase water rentals, royalties, taxes, or other charges associated with the Churchill River resource?
254	If there are circumstances in which future governments would be prevented from increasing these charges, what exactly are those circumstances, and what financial value could that restriction represent to the province over the life of the agreement?
255	Why are the rates so high for NL?
256	How do we sell our power to other provinces, states, or countries without asking Quebec for permission or expecting them to give up contracts later when we want to sell power?
257	What guarantee do we have that we can sell power to anyone other than Quebec?
258	Who is getting the power remaining from the amount allowed to NL and Quebec?
259	What are they paying for the energy?
260	Other than possibly less power blackouts, what are the residents of NL getting from this deal? It is our resources. The jobs are not full-time, permanent, only during construction.
261	How will resources, employment considerations, building supplies, cost overruns, nepotism, infrastructure be monitored? The Muskrat Falls project should be a lesson in what not to do.
262	How is the price of energy protected so we are not paying the high costs over time and Quebec gets lower prices?
263	How will the resources benefit residents rather than industry?
264	We know industry growth is important. I don't mean that should be forgotten. But if this deal is so good, where does it benefit the residents paying high utility bills?
265	Is there protection for the residents of NL against higher costs for electricity in the future?
266	Will coastal communities in Labrador get access to this electricity? Having lines run and connected should be part of the deal.

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
267	Who is ultimately paying for this project?
268	Federal is covering some of the cost but what portion is the responsibility of the NL government (taxpayers) and what portion is the responsibility of Quebec?
269	Not just upfront but throughout the project and in the future?
270	Why are you not prioritizing Newfoundland in the conditions and terms of the agreement?
271	Why are we not receiving all the profits for the sale of excess energy? You could lower the provincial debt dramatically and make the cost of living better for Newfoundlanders but instead are giving the bulk of the profits to others.
272	Why is there no option to automatically open the deal every 10 years to protect both sides?
273	A deal of this magnitude deserves a referendum, why is no referendum being held?
274	Why doesn't this deal take in to account the suffering of Newfoundlanders due to the extremely high cost of heating our homes?
275	Do you really think it's wise to lock in another 50-year deal with the last one being so unfair to us?
276	Do you think it's right to go back on your promise the hold a referendum?
277	Why would Quebec residents get a lower rate than Newfoundlanders & Labradorians?
278	Wouldn't it be better to just let the current deal expire?
279	Has the government seen the recent posts on social media? If not, they should be ready and taken into consideration.
280	Do you really think this deal is what residents want?
281	Will the revenue from this project be used to improve living conditions and access to basic necessities in Labrador?
282	New projects mean higher demand on amenities in Labrador, how is the government going to tackle issues such as transportation, housing, food security, and health care services that will be strained with an influx of people that accompany new projects Will there be any significant upgrades to Wabush power supply? We deal with frequent outages.
283	Why are residents of NL going to pay more for household electricity than Quebec residents when we own the resource?
284	Why does the contract have to be 50 years?
285	Is there a clause in place to allow for unfair conditions for NL to be rectified?
286	Why doesn't any deal with Quebec ensure that NL electricity rates are lower than in QC?
287	If their electricity originates in NL it should cost more there than here. Proximity should not be a consideration. Why are we selling electricity so far below market value?
288	Why does any deal on electricity from Churchill Falls have to look at other sources of generation?
289	That additional power should not be developed and sold to QC for them to resell. It should be a simple agreement. "This is how much electricity is for you to buy from NL." End of agreement. By making all these other considerations part of the deal, Newfoundlanders feel suspicious that there are tripping points being built in. The folks that made the original Churchill Falls deal felt that was a good deal back then but they could never imagine the consequences. Adding so many other clauses and stipulations will never protect NL from unpredictable world forces. Are you willing to strip the deal down to its basic components and ask NL to vote on them?
290	Why wasn't a stronger distinction made between power consumed in Quebec and power resold into external markets, allowing Newfoundland and Labrador to share more fully in the value of those external sales?
291	Given the rapidly growing power demands of AI and data centres, does the agreement contain safeguards allowing Newfoundland and Labrador to renegotiate terms if technological developments dramatically increase the value or strategic importance of Churchill Falls power?
292	For an agreement of this length, I do not believe Newfoundland and Labrador received a sufficiently significant upfront benefit to justify committing our resource so far into an unpredictable future. In the government's view, what did we gain by accepting another long-term commitment rather than retaining greater future optionality?
293	Why does the agreement have to be for 50, why can it not be for 20 years and then renegotiated?
294	Why is there no escalating clause to address potential increases in the cost of electricity especially considering the amount of money NL loss as a result of not having one in the 1969 agreement?
295	When you honestly compare what Newfoundland and Labrador is getting, in the long-term, as compared to what Quebec is receiving, who is truly the main long-term economic Beneficiary?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
296	Why are you allowing a 50-year deal without an automatic 25-year review or amendment opportunity?
297	Why is there no talk of a referendum, if the deal is good the citizens of this province will approve it?
298	It's the government's job to communicate this information in a clear and truthful manner so that we understand it and believe it. What is the plan to achieve this?
299	What prevents this deal from resulting in this province being shortchanged again as energy demand and prices sour in the future?
300	I'm not buying that we are protected and I don't think many of do, so what is the plan to educate us on that?
301	What are the provisions that will prevent another Muskrat Falls disaster?
302	What about this deal assures us that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians receive at lease as much of the benefits from this deal as Quebec? And why, given that we own this resource, would we not be benefiting even more than Quebec?
303	Understand the financial strain this province under to maintain our health care system, education system and provincial infrastructure, resulting from gross mismanagement and poor decisions, not unlike this one. What are we doing to stop the waste and restrain spending on things that can wait?
304	As an engineer that spent many years working on NL Hydro projects I observed first hand a great deal terrible inefficiency and waste. If we get a major injection of funds how are we going to manage it better than we did with the offshore money?
305	Are there plans to publicize the agreement that everyone thinks is so wonderful?
306	Has there been a sensitivity analysis on the impact of benefits to Newfoundland and Labrador for the various development scenarios and will this be publicized? The timing and uncertainty of some aspects of the various aspects of this project will no doubt affect the benefits to us.
307	Why are you not creating separate contracts for the existing Churchill Falls, the proposed Gull Island project and the proposed Labrador trough Windmill Project?
308	Why have we agreed to sell our Churchill Falls power to Quebec for only 2 cents/kWh from 2027 to 2041.we should be asking 6 cents/kWh.which is currently still only one third of today's price for kWh? If we received 6 cents/kWh for that period we could come close to paying off our provincial debt by 2041.
309	Why are we agreeing to CPI for inflation increases when Hydro-Québec itself never uses contracts more than 26 years and always has market price referencing built into their contracts when selling power to the US?
310	Why will Quebec have ownership in the Gull Island project if that is constructed?
311	Why can't NL secure loan guarantees and reduced loan rates directly from the $10 billion dollars that Mark Carney has committed to in federal support.we can hire and pay Hydro-Québec to build it.but we do NOT have to give them any ownership of that facility.the federal government is already providing support for Hydro-Québec's transmission lines?
312	Why isn't there a clause in the agreement to ensure that when market value increases Newfoundland receives the market value for it's electricity 10, 20 or 50 years from now?
313	After we hear from all the experts, will the people of NL be able to vote on the new agreement?
314	How can the Newfoundland government can't get a deal without us paying more per kWh then Quebec?
315	What exactly are the provisions in the agreement which ensures electricity rates for individuals stays affordable? Or at the very least ensure we don't pay the highest rates in the country, while 3rd party receivers of our electricity pay cheaper rates than we do?
316	Why did you run an election on the basis of having a public vote on any new deal if you aren't doing that?
317	Why are we entering an agreement lasting until 2077 rather than using 10- or 15-year terms?
318	Why are we giving away our greatest resource again, we should be waiting until 2041 to get control back again then develop Gull Island?
319	What's the PC government going to do to address this issue of high electricity rates?
320	Will there be any agreement on how much construction work at Gull Island and Churchill Falls will be available to Newfoundland and Labrador construction companies and suppliers versus the Quebec construction companies and suppliers?
321	Why was the public referendum cancelled by the Conservative party when it was a major campaign promise which helped get the current government elected?
322	Why are we signing another long-term "decades deal" with the Quebec government?
323	Why are we again rushing the deal?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
324	I have been wondering what Newfoundland and Labrador can do with all the new power generated by CF and Gull Island?
325	Aluminum refining and data centres seem to me to be ways to use the power and provide many jobs - both are electricity-intensive. Are there any plans for use of the power to benefit Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?
326	How is it that NL always gets the lesser deal?
327	The agreement has been presented as providing approximately $49 billion in net-present-value benefits to Newfoundland and Labrador. Can government provide a clear breakdown of how and when those financial benefits will actually flow to the province, including how much will become provincial revenue, how much will flow to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and how much will directly benefit residents?
328	The cost of groceries, housing, home heating and transportation has increased considerably, and gasoline in many areas is over $2 per litre. How does government intend to use the financial benefits of this agreement to provide meaningful and lasting cost-of-living relief to residents?
329	Government has announced a 15% residential electricity rebate on the first 2,000 kWh per month, with an estimated average saving of approximately $351 annually. Given the magnitude of the value attributed to this agreement, has government considered using a greater portion of the benefits to permanently reduce electricity costs for residents?
330	How was the 15% figure determined?
331	Newfoundland and Labrador continues to have one of the highest unemployment rates in Canada. Government has stated that 85% of Gull Island construction person-hours will be performed by Newfoundland and Labrador workers. What concrete training, apprenticeship and recruitment programs will be established to ensure unemployed and underemployed residents can qualify for these jobs?
332	How will the 85% employment commitment be monitored and enforced?
333	Will it apply to all contractors and subcontractors?
334	Will government publicly report the percentage of hours worked by Newfoundland and Labrador residents, the number of workers employed, their occupations and wages, and what consequences will apply if contractors fail to meet the commitment?
335	Will government commit to ensuring that employment created through these publicly supported projects consists of good-paying jobs with appropriate benefits, apprenticeship opportunities, strong occupational health and safety protections, and respect for workers' collective bargaining rights?
336	Construction employment is important, but it is temporary. What is government's plan to use the additional electricity and economic opportunities created through this agreement to establish permanent, long-term employment in Newfoundland and Labrador?
337	When deciding whether electricity should be exported or retained for industrial development, will government consider the number and quality of permanent jobs that could be created here?
338	Labrador's natural resources are responsible for generating an enormous portion of the value associated with this agreement. Beyond temporary construction employment, what permanent economic benefits, infrastructure and employment opportunities will remain in Labrador communities as a direct result of this agreement?
339	How will government ensure that rural communities throughout Newfoundland and Labrador-not only communities directly connected to the hydroelectric developments-share in the economic benefits?
340	What protections are in place for Newfoundland and Labrador taxpayers if the Gull Island development or other components of the agreement experience significant construction cost overruns?
341	Who ultimately bears that financial risk?
342	Ultimately, residents are hearing very large figures associated with this agreement, but a $49-billion net-present-value figure does not itself pay a family's grocery bill, fuel bill or mortgage. When should an ordinary Newfoundland and Labrador household expect to see a measurable improvement in its financial circumstances as a result of this agreement, and what will that improvement actually look like?
343	When I was in high school Joey Smallwood signed a long-term deal with NO escalation clause. My grandchildren will soon be in high school and now this government is going to sign another long-term deal with no escalation clause. WHY?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
344	The cost of food, rent, gas, clothing and so on is always increasing. What makes you think the price we charge Quebec should stay constant for the duration of this long-term contract? We have suffered since the 60s giving away our power for next to nothing. It's time for Quebec to pay it's fair market costs. At the very least there should be a review of the price we charge every 10 years so that we don't get robbed again.
345	Whether or not the people of Newfoundland and Labrador will actually benefit from any of this - Or if it will be all on the big three - NL Hydro, NL Power and NI Government. Or whether the people will see a real benefit - A percentage off a portion of your light bill will only go so far, and with the rising cost of oil and gas - It seems like it will cancel each other out. And how long will this percentage discount be applied?
346	Why have the Liberals not being given credit for their work on the agreement?
347	Why such a short time for opposition questions?
348	How is this deal better?
349	Will this agreement put Newfoundland/Labrador residential electricity rate on par with what Quebec pays?
350	How will the new agreement reduce power rates for NL customers in the long-term, aside from the immediate rebate?
351	The agreement lasts for decades, what guarantee is there that customers won't need to pay higher rates per kilowatt hour?
352	What if Quebec balks after their provincial election, and are unwilling to provide a definitive agreement?
353	When will NL start to receive extra revenue from the existing agreement, once a definitive contract is signed?
354	Will extra revenue be used to pay down debt to offset rate increases to rate holders?
355	Will Government of NL charge mining operations more than 4 cents per kWh, as they now do, and implement this as soon as a definitive agreement is signed?
356	Why isn't the power rebate higher and tied to future value of the project?
357	Please explain why by appearances it seems like Quebec is ahead of us in benefits?
358	I don't understand this project it's outside of the scope of anything I would understand but I do see that it feels like the benefits to Newfoundland are not great? Explain what they are in layman's terms please?
359	Why can't a 50/50 agreement be reached?
360	Will there be back payments to cover the disparity of prior Churchill Falls deal?
361	I would like the PM to address this project in everyday terms that people can understand can this happen? I feel he could do this if it was fair to both provinces.
362	Why is Quebec power cheaper than ours when it comes from the same place that we own?
363	Where is the Referendum that we were promised?
364	What's in it for middle income person right away?
365	Why can't we focus on ensuring a good and fair deal for NL and NLers instead of posturing it as better than the previous MOU?
366	How will this agreement adapt to adjust benefits to NL if the economics change over time. My concern is locking us into a Churchill Falls type agreement that made sense on day be but got worse and worse over time?
367	Why does the contract have to be for 50 years?
368	Why aren't our rates lower than Quebec's?
369	Why was isn't there a referendum as promised?
370	Why can it only be debated for 45 minutes?
371	What will be the percentage of profit shared between the 2 parties yearly?
372	What will the actual ownership look like?
373	Why are we not developing each phase of the projects separately?
374	Why do we not do the upgrades to the existing powerhouse ourselves and use the excess power from the upgrades to meet our own demand in Labrador?
375	Why even consider the ludicrous idea of locking in an agreement for 50 Years?
376	Why are we rushing to sign off on a less than equitable deal for NL when it is blatantly obvious that there would be a better follow up deal coming in due time?
377	The Premier's suggestion of a 15% reduction to NL residents is an insult consequently, why don't he walk this back and propose a deal whereby nl residents would pay the selling price to Quebec with a 10% markup for administrative costs? 8. Lastly, why did we not seek input from NL Light and power and hear their assessment of the MOU.

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
378	What is the price point that we need to obtain in 2041 for existing CFL(co) power that would be a break-even point as to what the bottom line is in the new MOU?
379	Why can't we get that amount and more in 2041?
380	Why so long an agreement?
381	Why is the agreement term 50 years?
382	Does Newfoundland and Labrador have a royalty agreement?
383	How much power can we sell outside of Quebec?
384	Will my power bills be less expensive after this deal is signed?
385	Why are we rushing to make a deal 15 years before it expires?
386	Why is the price paid tied to the CPI instead of the actual market value of electricity?
387	Why isn't the CPI being applied to the new price per KW to bring the original deal price in line with what has been negotiated?
388	Why is this government not taking this great opportunity to significantly enhance the overall well-being of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?
389	How many times do we have to be told of all the riches our province has yet our residents are among the lowest incomes in Canada and with the highest unemployment? Please seriously consider this opportunity.
390	Why are Quebecers paying 8 cents per kilowatt-hour and we pay 16 plus cents? And why are Labradorians paying 3 cents?
391	Why are Quebecers seemingly setting the terms of this deal and we know that they will benefit much more on our natural resource than we will?
392	The issue of sending surplus power to the US or Ontario is good but why is Quebec making more on that surplus than we are?
393	It's great that we're going to receive a rebate, but what stops the hydro and light and power from raising there percentage that they look for every year to a bigger percentage to the PUB, eventually the PUB gives up anyway and that swallows the rebate?
394	Why in the name of god are you rushing this agreement?
395	Why a 50-year deal with no reopenings?
396	Why are the rates fixed?
397	Why are you bundling our paid for existing facility, Churchill Falls, with the new proposed projects that may or may not happen?
398	Why are you not learning from our past mistakes and agreeing to another basically "locked in" low rate agreement?
399	Why are we taking on the majority ownership of a potential ' Gull Island' project but getting a small percentage of the power?
400	Why have you lied to the people of Newfound that elected you only on the promise of a referendum and then cancelled?
401	Why do you want to go down in history as Joey 2.0?
402	Slow down. What in gods name is your rush?
403	Do Newfoundlanders deserve this multigenerational decision to be rammed through?
404	Why choose to use a price escalation clause tied to CPI?
405	Why is this a better method than the defined escalation rate in the previous MOU?
406	Is the price per kWh that HQ pays for Gull Island power defined?
407	Does it increase or decrease over time?
408	What is the rationale for the current PC government stating that the new agreement does not have to undergo an independent review?
409	This is a "new" agreement. While much of it is based on the old MOU there are many significant and material changes (i.e., price setting, no guarantee of a new powerhouse at CF, claims of wheeling power and so on). The panel stated goals that the government makes the case have been met with the new agreement. What about the agreement as a whole?
410	The government has highlighted the ability to sell back power to HQ @150% of the base rate. Is this additional power that we could sell if not needed derived from the current CF upgrades? Or is this power coming from the windfarm or new powerhouse at CF?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
411	Is there a clause allowing this agreement to be revisited if extraordinary conditions develop in the generation of electricity nationally and/or internationally? If not - why?
412	If the original agreement for CF had a CPI escalator clause, what rate per kWh would HQ be paying for power?
413	Are you able to produce a graph/data that would compare the CPI escalator versus the original MOU escalation rate on the price paid by HQ over the life of the contract? For both CF and Gull Island.
414	Is the PC government able to commit to the building of a residence for the Lab West CONA campus to help train the tradespeople that will be required?
415	The PC government has framed the special session of the house as a debate. The latest information regarding the framework of the four days includes 45 minute of question period. Why has the government framed this as a "debate"? It would seem that the session is not in that particular format?
416	The basis of this new agreement leans heavily on the recommendations of the independent review panel. However, the panel never had to supply sources, basis of data or answer any questions to the general public. How and why should the residents of our province trust of such a panel?
417	The premier, ministers of the crown and sitting members are not experts in the field of hydroelectric developments. Why would the government not let the special session of the house to have experts that can answer questions regarding the project?
418	What is the timeline for Gull Island to be developed in December when the agreement is finalized?
419	Why is it that even with this new pending deal our electricity rates are not going to be lower?
420	Election promise was a referendum on MOU. Why are you not having it?
421	Why have Gull Island apart of Churchill Fall MOU? Should be seperate?
422	The MOU should reflect percentages for the future price of electricity. Why is it fixed dollar values?
423	The longer this goes unsigned the better deal can be obtained. Why sign now?
424	Why is Quebec customers getting cheaper electricity than Newfoundland customers?
425	I voted PC in last election because Liberals were going too fast. What changed?
426	Why is there no referendum?
427	The new agreement commits the sale of most of the energy from the existing CF plant for 51 years with not opportunity to adjust for market price changes over that time. WHY?
428	The present value ($33.8 Billion) of the payments from HQ for Churchill Falls energy over 51 years is unchanged. WHY?
429	The government was elected because it promised the people a review and a referendum. The review told us the MOU was not in our interest, we were not the principal beneficiaries. Now we have the same agreement for CF with the same value, same term and no review - no referendum. Why?
430	Like a lot of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, the budget deficit being half a billion dollars, give or take a couple hundred million, is a great concern. Simply put, roughly, how much will be added to provincial coffers?
431	Affordability if front and centre in the minds of voters. If the deal is as good as you say, will you revisit the 15% and potentially increase said rebate?
432	Why does the new agreement offer the same value for CF energy as the Old agreement - present value $33.8 billion from HQ for 51 years?
433	Why does the agreement have no pricing mechanism ties to the market price of electricity?
434	Why is the agreement for 51 years with no provisions for review?
435	Why is the government breaking its promise to let the people have the final say?
436	Why does Quebec get more of a benefit from Churchill Falls & Gull Island than Newfoundland and Labrador?
437	Why is the promised referendum on this issue not going to the people?
438	Is this deal going to benefit my children and grandchildren? Or is it going to be so beneficial to Quebec that our people will have leave the province?
439	Why are you selling out to Canada and Quebec? The people of Quebec pay next to nothing for their power, while Newfoundlanders must choose between their electricity bills and groceries.
440	We need to secure cross Canada rights of energy transmission with Quebec and everyone before a deal can be made. Maybe this should be brought up while an election is happening in Quebec. Why does NL have to be second class?
441	Is this a country or do we pay Quebec to allow us the crumbs?
442	Will this help get power bills back to at least pre-covid rates?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
443	It's there an escalator clause?
444	If the electric energy goes through the roof. Will we be getting more money? Or is it locked in and we lose again, like the Joey Smallwood deal?
445	Why the RUSH?
446	Why is Newfoundland and Labrador solely responsible for all future upkeep of these assets and facilities, especially considering we have a disproportionate say about how the power gets distributed?
447	Have we considered how this infrastructure will age?
448	Are we taking into consideration how truly valuable electricity will be in the future?
449	The dawn of AI data centers have brought this stark reality into the picture: North America and America as a whole cannot generate enough power to meet its future requirements. Can we even fathom how fast the demand for power will grow?
450	Does this contract address this future reality in a manner that ensures that newfoundland and Labrador is the prime beneficiary at all points in the contracts lifespan? Or are we better off waiting for a more valuable offer?
451	Why doesn't the government wait until 2041 when the current agreement ends and negotiate from a position of strength?
452	Why not ask the federal government to enact its responsibility to enable nfld to build transportation transmission networks across Quebec to deliver power to customers other than Quebec as is it's authority as a federal government?
453	Why is there no escalating clause?
454	It's very likely that the price of electricity will increase over the span of the 50 years so why are we not wanting to increase our outcome?
455	Why is the NL government accepting a 50-year term on an asset that is already paid off?
456	Why is the NL government accepting 25% of fair market value for baseload power?
457	How come the NL government does not tie the power price to pricing of Ontario Nuclear Power Plants?
458	Why the government does not bid on the spot market to maximize value?
459	One of the biggest concerns with the previous agreement was the absence off an escalator clause. Although the present agreement has a form of an escalator clause is there anything built into the agreement that would allow us to reopen the agreement should things change more drastically then thought. This clause of course can be built into to protect both Quebec and Newfoundland should there be swings either way?
460	You promised a referendum why did you go back on your promise?
461	Why is NL the only province that doesn't benefit from its resources?
462	If another province wants to benefit from our resource they should have to pay for it. The government is throwing monetary numbers out there but what are the differences in this agreement and the original agreement on Churchill Falls?
463	Why 51-year deal?
464	Industry standard is 30 years with five year renewals to adjust prices and so on based on market changes?
465	Has NL negotiated an opt out option with and without cause if see it working to our disadvantage?
466	What happens if NL waits until deal with Quebec expires?
467	Are there other buyers/developers for the existing Churchill Falls project i.e., Federal Government?
468	Has NL considered a royalty regime based on percent of income generated from project by Quebec?
469	Why is contract so complicated on pricing? Market value should be basis of price for the hydro electric power throughout timeframe of contract.
470	Why will we as NLers be paying 3 times the amount as Quebec?
471	Are there off-ramps in 2041, 2051, or 2061, or is 2077 baked in?
472	Why was the promised referendum dropped?
473	Who chairs the implementation committee, and can NL walk away from a draft PPA it does not like?
474	Can NL sell Churchill Falls power to New York if Quebec is short that month?
475	What is the P50 / P90 cost and in-service date Hydro-Québec is using internally?
476	Why is a second Churchill Falls powerhouse only a "study" while Gull Island is treated as if it is happening?
477	Does the federal loan guarantee cover NL's 60% or only Quebec's financing vehicle?
478	If Gull Island goes from ~$29 billion to $45 billion, who writes the cheque?
479	Who has first call on water in a dry year - Quebec's PPA or Labrador load?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
480	If NL keeps its Churchill Falls allocation for Labrador mines instead of selling it to Quebec at the 150% premium, how much Treasury cash disappears?
481	In which years does NL get the extra megawatts - and can a mine sign a 20-year contract against them?
482	What is the modelled value of simply letting the 1969 contract die in August 2041 and selling uncontracted Churchill Falls power?
483	Does signing now cap NL's claim that the 1969 renewal was unconscionable?
484	Does the 15% rebate get clawed back if Hydro's cost of service rises?
485	Are rural isolated systems and Labrador isolated diesel communities included in the rebate, or only the interconnected grid?
486	Does the federal loan guarantee require NL to keep specific ownership, offtake, or Indigenous-agreement conditions?
487	Is there a climate-risk clause if drought cuts Churchill production 15-20% in the 2050s?
488	Can NL refuse to export its reserved block if a Labrador customer appears in year 12? Or is unused power automatically dumped to Hydro-Québec?
489	How much of "new value" is just Ottawa paying NL to do a project Quebec wanted anyway?
490	Who owns Gull Island on day 18,251?
491	A 60/40 JV that never ends is a permanent Quebec seat on a Labrador river. Is there a community-benefits agreement with Churchill Falls town itself, which exists because of the plant?
492	If Ottawa later lists the plants as critical infrastructure, can it restrict exports NL thought it owned?
493	Does signing waive any outstanding legal theories against the 1969 renewal?
494	If wind is not built, does NL's reserved MW drop, and is that stated in the PPA or only in the press release?
495	Why are 2 important protections now gone that were in the 2024 MOU? Gull Island escalator clause which would increase the price of power over time. market-based pricing for Churchill Falls. Why do we pay 16 cents for power and Quebec residents pay half at 8 cents?
496	Why a 50 or 51-year deal?
497	Try 10 or 20 years maybe?
498	After the last 50-year deal, why another one?
499	For the people or NL, why are we not the primary.why rush this deal right now?
500	Why do we as a province have to rush into this deal?
501	It's time to start learning from our mistakes. Will we as the owner and supplier of the electricity get the higher share of the profits?
502	Why promise a referendum and not have one?
503	Why do the people of Newfoundland and Labrador still have a higher rate to pay for power?
504	When is the public referendum that was promised?
505	Why is there such a rush to get this pushed through?
506	Why was it not put to a referendum as promised?
507	Why would Newfoundland need to commit to a 50-year deal seeing how poorly the 60-year deal went?
508	Why is the government not acknowledging the promises it set to have a referendum?
509	Does the agreement prevent renegotiation or reopening for 50 years, including if Quebec’s status changes, a loophole emerges or there is a major change in service? If so, could Newfoundland and Labrador remain liable until 2077–78 without recourse?
510	How does the agreement define “sell-through” for Hydro-Québec?
511	It reads as though we only get to let Hydro-Québec sell a tiny amount less than 1000 MW of what we supply them and give us the preset price. Not what we charge but at the price they charge. Isn't that just a resale agreement not a right to transmit on their lines? It's a little dishonest to say we get to send and sell power through their lines.
512	Do you believe the political capital the Government of NL is wasting on not having a referendum as was a major political promise that got them elected is wise?
513	How will the government restore NL's faith in a government that has so far broken its two biggest(fix healthcare and a referendum on ANY Hydro deal) promises when neither has been, or will be, achieved?
514	After reading the Government comments as well as the independent public comments on both MOU1 and MOU2 why is it that there remains so much uncertainty around the various components of the deal?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
515	After all this time which has passed since the early talks began with the previous Liberal Government and now the PC Government. it still remains very confusing and perplexing around the various components of the deal. I'm still unable to discern as to whether it is a bad, fair, good or great deal for our Province?
516	Please, with all the so called great minds who have been at the table from both Parties, give the general public a more straight forward "truth" where we call feel confident that once again we are not selling out our future? If it cannot be made clearer for the general public to understand, then please do not bring it to a referendum vote for all!
517	I'd like to know if Tony Wakeham was pressured into making this deal for the "country" and not necessarily the "province"?
518	Is this an equitable agreement and will we be able to have some reduction in current electricity prices?
519	Will more debate on this subject harm the current NL development status on the Churchill River?
520	Where will NL get the power to transmit over the Quebec built lines and how does that work out for NL residents?
521	How is this a better deal for the NL peoples?
522	I as well as many other Newfoundlander's would like to know why we only got a 15% discount which amounts to a couple pennies and did not get the same rate Que residents pay 8.3 cents. This is our power and we are the ones who should be paying the least. Why will Que get 40% of Gull Island and is this actual ownership or revenue? This is our power and in no way should Que get to own any part it.
523	Why can't we get market prices for our electricity?
524	Why will Quebec residents pay much less for their electricity than NL residents?
525	Why all of a sudden is time of the essence?
526	This isn't right as we should be in the driver's seat. What is NL's plan for the next 51 years?
527	How much do we need on an annual basis to repay our debt, including that of Muskrat Falls?
528	What happens to electricity rates for NL'ers after 2030 when rate mitigation ends for Muskrat Falls?
529	Could the PC government follow through on its election promise to slow down this deal and get it right? I believe this deal is almost as bad as the 1969 contract.
530	Can the agreement be reviewed on a periodic basis (every 5 years) in order to amend to the rate structure to reflect changes in markets?
531	Why isn't the proposed rate higher in order to maximize returns to the province of Newfoundland?
532	Although the proposed rate is better than our current deal with Quebec, it appears we will not be getting the full benefit of our resources. What percentage of the proposed construction and operational jobs that will benefit Newfoundland and Labrador. What percentage of the power generated will be available to Newfoundland to use or sell as it sees fit. Will there be an oversight committee during all project phases to ensure Newfoundland gets what it deserves from the project?
533	Why can't the Federal government get us the right of way for power to be moved to the of North America?
534	Pathway to us for sale of hydro is that at fix price and can we send other sources of electricity?
535	Why didn't the government allow proper debate in the House?
536	Why is [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] still part of the team? She said the Liberal deal was the best, and now she is saying the PC deal is the best—not independent. Why doesn't the Premier establish an independent committee as was done with the Liberal deal?
537	Is there a mechanism in place for Newfoundland and Labrador to have an escalation clause with respect to the profits?
538	We need to have a safety net to avoid the possibility of Quebec having access to cheap power while Newfoundland and Labrador pays the price. Also, who will be the "owner" of Churchill Falls in 2041. And who will own Gull Lake?
539	Who has the responsibility of maintaining the NEW Federally funded transmission line?
540	Why is the proposed agreement set for a 50-year term?
541	Wouldn't a lower fixed term with an option to renew in 5-10-year increments to be decided by our authorities up to 50 years give us more control depending on what the markets are like at that time?
542	Is this new deal the same as the Liberal old deal. Did you know what you were doing the first time and if you didn't how can we trust what you are doing now?
543	Why are we bent on giving away the resource again?
544	Quebec needs the power more than we need to sell it, why not wait for a better deal?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
545	Signing any 50-year deal is ludicrous, why are we so bent on signing deals for 5 decades?
546	Why are we signing a 50-year agreement and repeating the same mistakes that were made in 1969?
547	If and when this deal goes through. If there is a rate reduction from Newfoundland Hydro. What is stopping Newfoundland hydro from raising the price per kilowatt hour? They have tried to raise the prices the last couple of years. Any rate increases will cancel out any savings that this deal would give the Newfoundland people.
548	Do you have any guarantees on secondary processing for these new mining projects, similar to Voisey's Bay mine and Long Harbour plant?
549	Will we be able to sell our power to whoever we wish, or will we be at Quebec/Ottawa's mercy?
550	Would you consider including renewal periods every 5-10 years where we can renegotiate rates and conditions during this 50-year deal?
551	Would you consider a ban on building AI data centers that will simply drain and exhaust the power that this deal will allow?
552	Will you commit to allotting the revenue from power sales in this deal to first zero-out our deficit, then use it to replace revenue from oil royalties in our budget so that oil royalties will be "free money" that could be used to pay off debt and start a resource sovereign wealth fund?
553	Will the residents of Newfoundland be paying lower rates than Quebec residents? The project is in Newfoundland so it should be cheapest in Newfoundland.
554	Newfoundland said they will be able to sell excess power to the USA. However, its under the discretion of Quebec? This should not be and must change.
555	Was any discussion or consideration given to trying to get funds upfront to pay down our debt?
556	Will the government honour Premier Wakeham's election commitment to hold a referendum on the new Churchill Falls agreement before it is finalized?
557	Can the option of waiting until the 1969 contract expires on 2041 be elaborated on detail?
558	An information vacuum exists as to what will happen?
559	What will both QC and NL be entitled to?
560	Would CFLCo be able to sell power at any price it negotiates at that time? This option does not appear to be explored, and if it was, it does not appear with the independent review or any other available material.
561	Why would NL take majority of the risk on GI, including debt, and still provide QC with 85% of the power at a highly reduced price will providing QC with 40% equity for perpetuity. This has not been explained to make any business or logical sense? NL does not need to develop this resource, and we should not give it away to QC for pennies on the dollar.
562	What other options have been explored to provide Labrador West and the mining sector with additional power?
563	It appears we are giving away another 51 years of power for little return for the "possibility" of more mining in the Labrador trough. Will the pro's of mining expansion surpass the revenue from a well executed deal (not the originally MOU or the new Churchill Falls MOU)?
564	The New MOU mostly omitted all suggestions made by the independent review panel, can this be explained?
565	The original MOU was deemed "not in the best interest" so the same deal was kept with minimal changes and pass off as a better agreement. How can the Government of NL sanction an independent review, and then completely ignore all recommendations made by the panel in rushing into an agreement?
566	The Government and especially the People of NL do not have a timeline to dictate when this deal must be signed. Why rush into such a substantial deal so quickly? Proper preparations should have been make before negotiations begun. As well the people should have a say in the implementation of this deal. There are many more questions than can be provided in this forum, these all require further explanations; - The price escalation clause is problematic. - Power transmission through QC has been misleading from the Gov. Of NL information releases. - QC retains almost all control of almost all aspects of hydro, generation, transmission for the duration of the deal. - Expansion of the generation station (both CF expansion and GI) will cost more money with no actual fiscal return other than to meet QC's peak generation demands.
567	Why doesn't the deal start with "No Power Bills for anyone in Newfoundland and Labrador, then we can go 50-50 on profit and new projects" That's pretty easy?
568	Why would anyone in NFLD EVER PAY MORE than Quebec?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
569	Show me exactly what Newfoundland and Labrador receives if the market value of electricity is 20¢/kWh in 2050? Not an economic-impact estimate. Not a $273-billion nominal headline. Not an average price calculated over 50 years. Show the actual contractual calculation.
570	Why isn't Nalcor able to sell power to Newfoundland power at the same rate it sells power to Quebec hydro?
571	I would like a clear explanation of why the escalation clause was removed?
572	Is that not leaving us in the same situation we have now. Quebec gets more with price increases but we do not?
573	Why is there no referendum on this new deal?
574	Will the agreement provide a permanent reduction in residential electricity costs?
575	I think Newfoundland needs to work on East/West market opportunities. As an example Darwin Australia is preparing to export power. Initial plans forecast that a new solar farm in the Northern Territory of Australia would produce up to 20 gigawatts of electricity, most of which would be exported to Singapore, and at a later point Indonesia, by a 4,300 km (2,700 mi) 3 GW HVDC transmission line. There is no stretch between Newfoundland and Scotland longer than this. Putting this power into Europe would be a great achievement. Also, the term, as I understand it, is 50 years. There has to be clauses to open the contract to address escalation of cost/market?
576	Minister Parrott publicly stated that a transmission line via the island of NL route would cost $25 Billion. Was this figure based on a study completed as part of the MOU2 deliberations or was it a number pulled out of the air? If it was based on a study, Gov NL should release the report.
577	Given what Newfoundland and Labrador lost under the original Churchill Falls agreement, what independent evidence can you provide to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that this new agreement gives our province the maximum possible long-term value for our own resource—and why should we commit ourselves to another long-term arrangement with Quebec rather than retain greater control of the power and sell it competitively into Canadian and U.S. markets?
578	Is there a super escalation clause in the event of totally unforeseen electrical prices due to whatever - inflation, demand, and so on?
579	Does NL share capital costs?
580	Has data centers and trans ocean fiber customers been considered?
581	Is there a plan to deal with faulty engineering cost projections that plagued Muskrat?
582	Will the construction phase involve fly-in/fly-out?
583	Why am I being asked if I identify as indigenous?
584	Has your government engaged with, read or considered the views of prominent, informed NL critics of this recent MOU, including some from your own political party? If not, do you intend to?
585	Is NL the primary beneficiary of this project?
586	Why is the term so long, and why is there no revisit term clause? (shorter interval)
587	Why can't the existing upper Churchill Falls plant/ facility be negotiated on its own.we own it and could reap benefits from it quickly.creating revenue to further develop Gull Island, wind and so on?
588	If Quebec doesn't want that, why not live out the next 15 years of the existing contract.to be on strong footing to renegotiate the existing power plans. On terms that really favour NL?
589	Will Quebec residents pay less than Newfoundland and Labrador residents for electricity?
590	If HD Quebec pays to develop Gull Island, who will own it?
591	Who decides how much excess power NL can sell to others, and for what price?
592	How is the rate determined?
593	Is this in the best interest of NLers?
594	Why has your government reneged on the promised referendum?
595	Why is there a very limited amount of time put on the debate?
596	What is driving the rush?
597	Is your evaluation of the more power(available to NL) for more value to sell to non NL buyers and to service mining developments in Labrador really accurate? Wouldn't it be either/or. Not both? Even if the accessory plans (Gull Island/Wind) do become reality?
598	Why are rates per kWh not adjusted with inflation, in your MOU?
599	Why are residents of Newfoundland Island going to continue paying considerably more for electricity than customers in Quebec and parts of Labrador-especially when this is our resource?
600	Why such a long contract with Quebec, 50 years, again, why locked in?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
601	Why give Quebec control of NL' Hydro resources?
602	Why is the current government of NL selling out this province?
603	Why isn't there a referendum on the new contract as promised by the current government?
604	Why are you limiting questions, debate, and public transparency?
605	Why is there a 50-year deal?
606	Why did you not follow the IRC recommendation to unbundle the projects?
607	What happens if HQ decides not to develop Gull Island?
608	Why do we not get 65% of Churchill Falls power?
609	This deal does not make us the principal beneficiaries of this resource. Why would agree to this?
610	Why is there a rush to get this signed? The time between the original MOU and the DCIA allowed a better deal to be negotiated. Time works for us, not Quebec.
611	How can we compete with Quebec for new industry when they have more power from CF to offer, power at a lower average cost?
612	What is the government's strategy?
613	The government did not follow the major recommendations of the IRC report therefore this proposal should be subject to an independent review. Why is this not happening?
614	Will there be any kind of in person public debate or other ways for the general public to get their concerns heard and addressed or will this just be shoved down our throats no matter the agreement language?
615	Why are we not having a referendum?
616	Why don't we wait until 2041 to renegotiate this agreement?
617	Why is a 50-year term appropriate for this agreement? Why is it necessary?
618	Newfoundland and Labrador are paying too much for electricity. Why isn't this deal addressing that hardship?
619	A 15 percent rebate is a joke. Why is home heating taxed? There alone is our rebate.
620	Why isn't there clear and concise, easily digestible information about the real benefits and breakdown of the MOU, how it effects power costs, and not just a "rebate" that doesn't do anything, why haven't questions been asked of the public on what would actually help, no partisan information just pure facts?
621	Has Premier Wakeham sought the support of the Prime Minister and the federal government to press fairer terms for NL by keeping open the possibility of using federal constitutional powers to permit transmission to markets beyond Quebec? If not, why not?
622	What is the urgency of signing an agreement with Quebec in the Mid 2020s?
623	Why not wait until closer to 2041?
624	Why not seek a short-term agreement for now in hopes of changes of factors that affect what is an agreement that is realistic to expect?
625	Why does Hydro-Québec retain such a large ownership interest in Churchill Falls and related corporations, will this continue and, if so, why?
626	Why isn't the price for hydroelectricity reflect external market prices or at least much closer to those prices and account for inflation to the end of term?
627	Why will there not be a referendum on this MOU?
628	What efforts has the government made to avoid exposing taxpayers and ratepayers to additional burden as time goes on?
629	What are the immediate benefits for NI?
630	What would be the benefits, in say, 10 years?
631	Are NL workers given priority for jobs?
632	Is it equally advantageous for both provinces?
633	Does Quebec retain a larger share of Churchill Falls than NL? If yes, please explain. If no, please explain.
634	Why are NL ratepayers paying such high electricity rates when we sell to Quebec at such low prices which will remain low over the life of a new Agreement?
635	What is the plan to reduce electricity rates for Newfoundlanders & Labradorians?
636	The 15% reduction does little to offset the costs when my electricity bill increased $65 per month on September 1. Both husband and I are seniors. Is this a one-time rebate?
637	Is there plan to further reduce costs?
638	When will ratepayers start to see reductions in their costs - not the one time rebate?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
639	Will the full MOU and eventual Agreement be made public?
640	How much of the projected $49B goes to Treasury?
641	How much to NL Hydro?
642	How much to bonuses?
643	How much money will actually flow to the NL Government?
644	How much of the $49B is guaranteed?
645	How much is assumed?
646	Has the government thought about what this additional money can support? Healthcare? Housing? Schools?
647	What concessions did PC Government give to Quebec?
648	The PC Government, when in opposition, walked out of the HOA when the Liberal government presented the 2024 MOU. How is this 2026 MOU better?
649	What did the Dec. 2024 MOU miss or concede that the Aug. 2026 corrected?
650	Please list. What new concessions were given to Quebec that were not in 2024? Please list.
651	What is the exact language that gives Newfoundland and Labrador "complete optionality"?
652	The government says NL has "complete optionality" over its allotted power-whether to use it for industrial development or sell it. What does that actually mean? Please detail this.
653	Can Quebec restrict, delay or influence our ability to sell electricity elsewhere?
654	Does Quebec have first right of refusal?
655	is it sold to Quebec who then sells it?
656	What percentage of the economic benefits will actually remain in Labrador?
657	How many permanent jobs will be created in Labrador - not just construction jobs and not person hours?
658	What infrastructure needs to be built before the new construction projects start?
659	Is there consideration to the affordable housing crisis in Labrador?
660	The government says it has "begun conversations" with the Innu Nation about opportunities to participate as "full partners". What does "full partner" mean?
661	Will the Innu Nation receive royalties, have equity ownership? Please explain this.
662	Regarding transmission lines - how much does/will NL pay Quebec to use their transmission lines?
663	Who bears increased transmission costs, and how are those costs treated under the MOU?
664	What is the risk?
665	Who bears the risks - NL?
666	The independent review committee concluded that the 2024 MOU was not good for Newfoundland and Labrador. What specifically did the PC government negotiate in the new MOU? Please identify these one by one.
667	Before committing Newfoundland and Labrador to this Agreement, which could last 50 years, does the Wakeham government have an independent, province-wide strategic electricity planning body that assesses our total electricity needs, generation capacity, transmission requirements, industrial demand, export opportunities, renewable development and electricity rates. This is not the NL Hydro Strategic Plan. Who is independently accessing whether the Churchill Falls & Gull Island decisions made today are in the best interest of NL & Lab considering the resources available & other potential development options?
668	Why not let the current Churchill Falls Agreement expire?
669	Would that not put NL & Lab in a better position to negotiate?
670	How many years will the new Churchill Falls agreement bind Newfoundland and Labrador, and what is the exact expiry date?
671	Will we have any right to renegotiate the agreement before it expires, or are we locking the province into another multi-generational agreement?
672	Can the Agreement of 5 years, 10 years be negotiated?
673	Why should we accept another Agreement with Quebec that extends beyond 2041 without first seeing the complete financial, legal and strategic analysis showing why that term is in the province's best long-term interest?
674	What are the risks to Newfoundland and Labrador over the life of the MOU & Agreement?
675	Who bears the highest risk? NL? Please detail the risks to the province. Thank you.
676	Why are Newfoundland electricity rates still going to be higher than Quebec's when we own the power?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
677	Why are we trying to sign another 50-year deal as opposed to a much shorter term, so that we can ensure that inflation and market rates are more closely reflected? A 50-year term leaves too much speculation as to what will happen with inflation and market rates over those years. This again eaves far too much risk that Newfoundland will not prosper and continue to lose money with the deal.
678	This agreement should not proceed, as a resident of this province, we should come first with respect to the natural resources and benefits from them. Why is it we are paying more for electricity when we have the resources to be paying the lowest rates in the country?
679	What is the rush?
680	Why such a low rate per kilowatt hour paid to NL by Quebec?
681	Why sign for 50 years again?
682	With demands increasing for electricity this should open up for review periodically, maybe every ten years, with an escalation clause, when rates increase in the market, NL gets paid more. Why are we paying double in NL for residential rates?
683	Why has our premier backtracked on almost every promise he made regarding the MOU, in the last election campaign?
684	How about posting a summary of agreement listing pros & cons plus the differences from previous MOU?
685	Why was the CPI chosen to determine the price of future power?
686	What will Hydro-Québec pay for the energy it purchases from each of the first 5 years of the agreement?
687	Why pick a 50-year term?
688	Why is the Government of NL agreeing to a locked in 50-year agreement with no adjustment clause or reopener?
689	Why are Quebec residential users paying one third the price for power when we own the resource?
690	Why are we not charging market prices for the power? Unless these conditions change there should not be an agreement.
691	For the power that NL can retain, does NL have the right to the negotiate the price for that power?
692	What is the net cost to deliver it to market?
693	What is the ownership structure for CFLCo after the agreement is put in place?
694	If the new deal will land us +- 275 Billion dollars over its life. What would we make from Churchill Falls if no deal is made we let the contract expire in 2041?
695	Why haven't we negotiated a fair market value for our electricity in the contract? The value of dollars today will not have its same purchasing power in 30-50 years. It feels like history repeating itself.
696	Long-term electricity pricing What provisions in the new agreement ensure that the price Newfoundland and Labrador receives for its power will reflect the future value of electricity and will not become substantially below market value over the life of the agreement? (This appears to be one of the concerns that was identified with the 2024 MOU)
697	Protection against another 1969 situation Are there specific provisions that will allow the agreement to be reviewed or adjusted if electricity markets, technology or economic circumstances change substantially over the next 20, 30 or 40 years? (The main problem with the 1969 Churchill Falls contract is that it was locked in and did not allow adjustments to reflect changing circumstances and electricity values)
698	Newfoundland and Labrador's ability to use its own power If industrial development in Labrador requires more electricity than presently anticipated, does Newfoundland and Labrador have an unconditional right to redirect its Churchill River allocation from export sales to domestic economic development?
699	Are there any circumstances in which Quebec could prevent this or impose a financial penalty on the province for doing so?
700	Construction-cost overruns and financial exposure Large hydroelectric and transmission projects can experience major cost overruns as we saw with Muskrat Falls. Who will bear the financial risk if Gull Island or the Churchill Falls expansion costs are substantially more to build than currently estimated?
701	Is there a maximum financial exposure for Newfoundland and Labrador taxpayers and ratepayers?
702	Transmission and access to outside markets Are Newfoundland and Labrador's rights to transmit and sell electricity through Quebec to Ontario And United States markets legally guaranteed for the entire term of the agreement?
703	Who is responsible for maintenance on Churchill Falls (NL and/or QC)?
704	To what percentage?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
705	If NL sells power, will NL rates increase for NL'ers?
706	When does this contract expire?
707	Does this agreement affect Muskrat Falls?
708	We're talking billions of dollars for now, shouldn't we be talking trillions for the future?
709	Does QC need permission from NL to sell power?
710	If we go through QC to sell power, how much $ are we giving QC?
711	We need a solid explanation from Tony Wakeham of why he sees this MOU as acceptable? We need in-person consultations, town halls throughout the province.
712	Why does the term have to be for 50 years?
713	According to independent experts, this deal is not much better than the MOU 1, which the Liberals had negotiated. In addition, there are some very worrying points, first of which is this is a closed 50-year deal with no opportunity to renegotiate pricing, why would we put ourselves into that situation? Secondly, the pricing is not tied to market rates, again why?
714	Why is this deal being rushed through, without public approval as promised during the last election? After reviewing and analyzing the agreement, there are many risks and issues not yet negotiated that could have a significant, negative impact on Newfoundland. What are you doing to mitigate these issues?
715	Why does the DCIA require NLH to grant Hydro-Québec exclusivity over Gull Island and provide development access before binding commercial terms and effective enforcement remedies are in place?
716	Why are Gull Island and the Churchill Falls upgrades proposed to be exempt from Public Utilities Board oversight while project offtakers bear both favourable cost outcomes and cost overruns?
717	How will Newfoundland and Labrador be protected from cost escalation and financing risks when Hydro-Québec and SEBJ lead construction and Hydro-Québec controls Gull Island financing, including possible subordinated debt that could reduce distributable cash flow?
718	Why would Hydro-Québec hold majority construction and financing control despite NLH’s expected 60% ownership, and are NLH’s approval thresholds sufficient to protect the Province?
719	How do the agreement’s sales restrictions, notice requirements, scheduling rights and capacity caps limit NLH’s ability to use or export its energy entitlements?
720	How will the proposed water-management agreement protect Muskrat Falls’ operating value, and will the model and agreement be independently reviewed before signing?
721	What binding protections will ensure Indigenous consultation and partnership, enforceable local benefits, required permits and satisfactory federal support before irrevocable commitments are made?
722	When Mr. Wakeham was in opposition he wanted an independent review of MOU 2024, where is our independent review of Mr. Wakeham's MOU?
723	Why is Mr. Wakeham pushing this when he himself said it takes as long as it takes?
724	Where are our recall rights?
725	Where is our 20-year not 50 deal?
726	Why is Quebec getting the lion's share of the power?
727	Is Mr. Carney planning an AI data center in Quebec?
728	What is Mr. Carney's plan for the critical minerals out of western Labrador?
729	More power allocation to western Labrador I wonder why?
730	Why not wait? I would really appreciate straight answers not a lot of [LANGUAGE REDACTED].
731	How will the Innu Nation be involved in decision-making about this agreement?
732	Will the provincial government acknowledge the history of Innu in Labrador beyond its current 300-year framework?
733	Why are Newfoundlanders going to pay more for electricity than Quebecers or to whomever Quebec sells power from Churchill Falls?
734	Why is the contract for 55 years?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
735	Why is the new contract being convoluted with the development of wind farms and Gull Island?
736	Can these developments be negotiated in a separate agreement?
737	Is there an existing study regarding building more capacity at Churchill Falls?
738	Newfoundlanders were promised a direct say in accepting or rejecting the new Churchill Falls agreement. When will this vote take place?
739	An escalator clause of 2.6% is ludicrously small, with the demand for electrify set to skyrocket in NA because of the AI centres and EVs. Aren't you doing exactly the same as the 1969 contract?
740	Why is there a tremendous 'rush' to sign a deal with Quebec when we still have 15 years remaining on the old contract?
741	Why isn't there an escalating clause to ensure NL's future financial interests?
742	Why isn't NL paying 'less' for electricity instead of more, especially after NLians have invested over $13.5 billion in Muskrat Falls alone?
743	A 15% reduction is good, but really, that's just the removal of the taxes that are currently on electricity bills and have been a bone of contention for a long time, with people asking for the removal of the 15% HST on all electricity bills. What about a further reduction in the price per kWh, too?
744	Under the announced 2026 deal, it appears that Quebec cannot simply take all of Newfoundland's surplus power and leave Newfoundland with nothing. Is this possible?
745	Could Newfoundland build a transmission line through the Maritimes and bypass Quebec?
746	Does Newfoundland and Labrador retain the unrestricted right to build new transmission infrastructure and move its allocated Gull Island and Churchill Falls power to any legally accessible Canadian or U.S. market?
747	What happens if Gull Island experiences construction cost overruns similar to Muskrat Falls?
748	Why is the increase in price that Quebec will pay Newfoundland linked to the Consumer Price Index as opposed to the increase in the price that the electricity is being sold for?
749	If the price of electricity rises it should be directly linked to the price that Newfoundland receives. Why is there such an urgency to sign this MOU?
750	Why does this deal appear to be so rushed when it will have implications on Newfoundland and Labrador for generations?
751	Why is Premier Wakeham and Minister Parrott using terms like "the bankers told us" and "People have it wrong, transmission lines are expensive? " Their grand proclamations make it seem like this is a deal they either don't understand themselves or can't explain in plain language.
752	Most of the population lives on the island. Why isn't the power price at the same as Quebec or close to it?
753	Why is there no escalation clause?
754	Why should we pay more per kilowatt hour on our residential rate than Quebec?
755	Why the need to sign a 50-year contract again? If so can the contract be renewed if the benefits favour Quebec more in comparison to NL benefits?
756	Which province benefits the most from this agreement?
757	I've been an investor in publicly listed companies for over 40 years and have seen many complex transactions valued in the billions put to shareholders for a vote. Shareholders are typically provided with detailed analysis prepared by external parties with expertise in the specific area of business. While I don't see the need for a referendum, I wonder why we can't do something similar here?
758	This is a business venture where we can estimate the investment and future cash flows based upon assumptions. Can we get someone who does this for a living to review whether we are getting a fair deal?
759	Alternatively given the demand for cheap clean energy can we go to the marketplace to see if there is any interest in financing this deal so we can go it alone. While we may still need to access through Quebec we could force their hand and maybe the hand of the feds who seem to be afraid to challenge Quebec's efforts to prevent us from developing our resources?
760	Why don't we separate the two conversations? Isolate the 2041 renewal from the new project and come back to it later. Evaluate the new project and make a go - no go decision and then move to the renewal.
761	Given the stated 2,350 MW of retained power, 985 MW of market-access arrangements and $49-billion package value compared with $36 billion previously, will government provide a component-by-component analysis of the value received by each province, the risks assumed by Newfoundland and Labrador and the rights, control, market access and future optionality committed under each component?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
762	Is the $36-billion and $49-billion figures using the same valuation date, discount rate, assumptions and scope so that the public can make a true apples-to-apples comparison?
763	How will we be impacted if rate of inflation is much lower than future electricity rates?
764	How is this tied to if we did the escalation option we carry more debt for Gull Island this is not clear?
765	Why would we carry more debt for Gull Island?
766	Why in the name of all that is decent did you not ask for an official recognition of Labrador being part of NL by ALL of Quebec, including Quebec Hydro, and that anyone in Quebec Hydro or the Government of Quebec, who produced documents showing Labrador as part of Quebec, will be FIRED forthwith?
767	How can anyone who negotiated the subject MOU (August 17, 2026) accept the absence of an inflation-indexing clause similar to those used for the Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security? The so-called “inflation clause” compares one year of CPI with the previous year and may not reflect sustained inflation such as that experienced in the 1970s.
768	What happened to the promised Referendum? I want to have the opportunity to vote on it, and educate everyone I know how to vote on it!
769	How are the MHA's who vote for this deal going to face their children, grandchildren, when the inevitable happens and they realize that they were sold out to Quebec?
770	They have to know in their hearts that this is not what they wanted to get when they disagreed with the 2024 MOU. How can they sleep at night, knowing full well, but not admitting it, that NL is being led down a garden path, giving away our resource?
771	Why couldn't our Federal "Partners" to this deal demand that Quebec permit transmission of our electricity across Quebec to sell to other provinces of Canada and US markets? What you have obtained is a Quebec-controlled arrangement to negotiate a sale at their prices to US only. We have NO Control of that arrangement.
772	The agreement has specifically addressed that the NL transmission assets will be on a cost-of-service model following the original term. The agreement has no such reciprocal language on access to the HQ transmission. This is a substantial risk at the end of the agreement. Why was this not treated within the mou?
773	Why are we not getting the referendum we were promised?
774	Where is the clause to reopen and for rate change?
775	Get NL the same household rate as Quebec for duration of the deal. If my friend in Montreal pays 10 cents kWh, we pay 10 cents. If NL Power wants to increase rate, all increase BUT all have to agree. That is fair. Why should we pay double for our resource?
776	Will the provisions of attachment I really drive local benefits?
777	Shall occur in NL' is materially different than 'nl resident'. Why drive this requirement if non nl residents will work in NL for short periods of time but likely continue to pay income take in their home province? This is of minimal benefit and will drive up project cost.
778	Will the cost recovery for the UC turbine enhancement be recovered solely through the charges to HQ or also through the recaptured energy sold to NLH?
779	Did the province try to make the Gull Island a firm requirement?
780	I would expect the initial revenue from Hydro-Québec on the upper Churchill will be sufficient for muskrat falls rate mitigation. Can you provide the net revenue to government each year with the MF rate mitigation accounted for?
781	Why is a 50-year deal ok now but it wasn't while the election was going ahead?
782	My most important question which few answer is how will the new money be spent because what I have heard it will mean no change to outlets daily lives, same high taxes, horrible highways and high electrical bills? To me this is a deal that will help the government bridge their spending issues and nothing more.
783	Why not have mandatory reviews of payment schedules at intervals? Say every 5 years.
784	Why isn't the purchase price of electricity linked to market conditions?
785	This MOU2 is the same as the 1969 Churchill Falls contract. The length is 51 years with no reopeners and no provisions for price change due to increased market value over time. No large hydroelectric deal has 50-year contracts. Will this PC Government change the length of the contract and have reopeners and provisions for price change?
786	How can you proceed with an outdated environmental assessment?
787	What benefits will there be for Labrador?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
788	It will be challenging for Labradorians to get jobs because not in unions (similar to what happened during Muskrat Falls), infrastructure in neighbouring communities already face maximum use including roads, healthcare, housing, neighbouring communities saw an increase in social issues that are not able to be supported with current resources, health concerns for those that hunt and fish in the area, loss of traditional lands and culture, and so on. Will the power be used to connect all Labrador's coast or will they be left out again?
789	Why is the province allowing other to dictate timelines for a project in Labrador?
790	Will the province reconsider proceeding if there is a lack of support from residents?
791	Why are we having the agreement for 50 years?
792	Why don't our electricity rates decrease once this is completed?
793	Why do we pay more for electricity than Labrador?
794	Are we not NL - one province?
795	Why did you break your promise about a referendum?
796	Are you trying to hide something from the people?
797	Why is this considered a better deal?
798	You have identified a value for this contract that NL will obtain theoretically. Based on the same assumptions, what is Quebec walking away with?
799	There are a number of individuals with seemingly in depth knowledge of Churchill Falls. Why are you not responding to such very reasonable critiques on a point by point basis so that the ordinary NL can make up their own minds? The length of this agreement is also a total no go From my perspective. We are still wearing the last one, and even if this agreement is wonderful now, it can always need changing in the future.
800	What is the length of the agreement?
801	Why can't the agreement be revisited every 10 years so it doesn't affect future generations?
802	How crazy is the government to sign a 50-year deal?
803	It's insane it think that this is being pushed through in a rush without any independence in the form of a review. Why not?
804	What's the hurry?
805	Why are we being short changed on price of electricity?
806	Why not wait till 2041 if this is the best you can do?
807	Only 45 minutes to ask questions in the HOA how absurd is this why?
808	Why is the federal government rushing this and of province is rolling over?
809	Why am I wasting time asking questions to hear a bunch fed back to me?
810	Why did this elected government lie to me as a voter? Re promised referendum.
811	Why did you fight against the original 2024 MOU?
812	What has changed?
813	What is the difference between the liberal and conservative deal?
814	What happens when the Quebec election happens and the new QC government changes their mind?
815	What gives the government the right to break it's flagship election campaign promise to the people?
816	Why are we doing this now - What's the rush?
817	Why isn't there more opportunity for public feedback than a questionnaire on a website open for 6 days on a deal that lasts 50 YEARS! Why is the deal 50 YEARS long?
818	Why are we taking the backseat to QC again by selling the vast majority of the power to them for resale?
819	Why wasn't this deal done to incorporate lower electricity rates for ALL of Newfoundland and Labrador?
820	What weren't the communities in Labrador that have to operate on diesel generators for electricity promised to be electrified under this deal?
821	Why was a wind turbine farm thrown in as an afterthought at the last minute? If this deal is so great why wasn't the government prepared to sell it to the people versus imposing it upon us AGAIN!
822	Why does this have to be a partisan decision?
823	For the best outcome for the province and citizens, could partisan politics be set aside in order to assemble the best and most educated minds on the matter from all parties?
824	Could we not create an all-star panel of the best politicians and business people?
825	Also, why not have the promised referendum? Rushing through the negotiations is not necessary.
826	Why enter another 50-year agreement, and can it be reopened during its term?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
827	Is our province giving up any rights to land or other properties in this deal. -Even though I know that we in this province have high electricity rates (highest in Canada) due to high production cost and a low population was there no way that we who own the hydro rights of our province could not arrive at a deal that actually lower the rates for ourselves so that for once we actually gained from our own assets?
828	The federal government had no difficulty telling BC that a pipeline was coming through their province even though they said no, so why is there a problem telling Quebec that NL will be sending electricity through their province and they will not have the right to control it?
829	Why should we be happy to sign a deal with Quebec that, as one of our negotiators said guarantees them "cheap" power when we will continue to be the most expensive in Canada?
830	We should have full transparency on what is being offered and a referendum to decide on whether or not we as a population accept or reject the proposal. The negotiations of such an important proposal should be performed by experts who are completely arms length from the current political party and who are qualified on par with the negotiating team that Hydro-Québec currently has. Please clarify exactly how Newfoundland Hydro proposes to do this?
831	Why are future values of electricity ties to the CPI which the Bank of Canada tried to keep near 2% when costs for electricity increase well beyond the CPI?
832	Why is 40% of Gull Island sold to Quebec?
833	Will the Wakeham administration appoint a new advisory panel to evaluate the 2026 MOU?
834	Will the Wakeham administration refer the 2026 MOU to the PUB?
835	Will the Wakeham administration admit they did not obtain any additional wheeling of electricity through Quebec?
836	Why was the price escalator removed?
837	Removing Gull Island from the equation, because it's not a realized asset, how is this going to be different than the 1969 agreement?
838	How long is it going to take to build Gull Island and is there any guarantee that it will actually get built?
839	Who will be responsible for any Gull Island cost overruns?
840	The citizens of this province are already burdened with the cost overruns from Lower Churchill. Was there a lessons learned analysis done for Lower Churchill and what is being done so we don't see the same problems with Gull Island?
841	With the promise of new wind farms in Labrador, are you going to make it easier for individuals to create their own wind power and sell it back to the grid?
842	In what way does the new deal benefit Newfoundland and Labradorians more than the deal the former Liberal government had in motion?
843	Why are we giving Quebec 40% ownership of Gull Island in the agreement?
844	Why are we as taxpayers and residents of Newfoundland and Labrador not getting more of a break in electricity rates than Quebec residents or at least close?
845	How does the price of our energy sold to Quebec increase over the time of the deal?
846	If energy prices sharply increase (above inflation for example), are there mechanisms to increase the sell-price?
847	How exactly does the removal of the escalator clause of the 2024 agreement save the province money on debt?
848	What do we get in return of not getting retroactive payments that were in the 2024 agreement?
849	Question for the negotiators: what are three items you wanted added to the agreement with Quebec that never made it, and why they were not accepted by Quebec?
850	Will NL own the water resources? If no then who owns it?
851	Why are we paying so much for electricity?
852	We sell to Quebec for 6 cents/ kWh yet we pay Why the rush, it's Quebec that is in urgent need so let's wait it out and own 100%?
853	What is in this deal for the Island portion of NL?
854	Why are we not afforded cheaper hydro rates than Quebec?
855	Will the Government of NL commit to creating a legacy fund to improve community infrastructure in relation to economic development (such as better roads, improved land fill, faster development permit processes, multi year funding for economic organizations such as the chamber)?
856	What Specific legally binding guarantees does NL have to secure its own dedicated, schedulable transmission capacity for exporting power, independent of Hydro-Québec's operational discretion?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
857	Why did NL not secure majority operational control of Gull Island, and what mechanisms exist to ensure NL and not Hydro-Québec determines dispatch priorities, domestic supply needs, and export timing over the long-term?
858	Does the agreement include a guaranteed minimum price and a market-indexed escalator for power sold to Quebec, and if not, how is NL protected from repeating the long-term revenue collapse experienced under the 1969 contract?
859	What protections ensure NL retains exclusive rights to future Churchill Falls redevelopment, such as turbine upgrades, efficiency improvements, and repowering, without requiring Hydro-Québec's approval or shared control?
860	I believe the original CF agreement expires in 16 years? We've waited this long. Surely we can afford to wait a little more and use an expiring contract as leverage to get an even better deal for ourselves.
861	I was wondering if we could expect some more of the money we would be getting to come back to the ratepayers? The break we are going to get when the deal is signed seems to be very little.
862	Why proceed now rather than wait until 2041, and how do Muskrat Falls and Gull Island fit into the broader agreement?
863	Muskrat Falls was already built at enormous cost to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, and Gull Island is now being brought into this new arrangement. If we have already developed Muskrat Falls and are now talking about developing Gull Island and expanding Churchill Falls, how much of the future power and economic benefit from all of these projects will actually stay in Newfoundland and Labrador, and how much will ultimately flow to Quebec?
864	The government says this new agreement is worth $49 billion to Newfoundland and Labrador in 2026 and provides major new opportunities through Gull Island, Churchill Falls expansion and transmission. But Hydro-Québec itself says the agreement guarantees Quebec access to 7,200 MW for the next 50 years, including existing Churchill Falls generation and new production from Churchill Falls and Gull Island. So here's the question I think Newfoundlanders deserve answered: If Newfoundland and Labrador owns 65.8% of Churchill Falls and is developing additional resources at Gull Island, why are we still guaranteeing Quebec long-term access to the majority of this power for another 50 years?
865	Why aren't we waiting until 2041, when the existing contract expires, and then negotiating from the strongest possible position?
866	Why can Newfoundland and Labrador not receive the same effective market value as Quebec, with a binding guarantee that its ratepayers and industries will not pay more for power originating from the Churchill River?
867	We are also being told that Gull Island will create enormous new value. But if Quebec is helping finance or participate in the development, and is simultaneously receiving long-term access to the resulting power, who is actually taking the risk, who owns the assets, who gets the power, and who captures the long-term profits?
868	What happens to the enormous negotiating leverage Newfoundland and Labrador would have in 2041 if we sign this agreement now?
869	You previously argued that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians deserved a say in a major Churchill Falls agreement. Where is the referendum on this 50-year commitment?
870	Muskrat Falls was supposed to transform our energy future. Churchill Falls has already generated enormous value for Quebec. Now Gull Island and an expanded Churchill Falls are being added to the equation. Why should Newfoundlanders and Labradorians agree today to lock up the Churchill River's future until 2077 instead of waiting until 2041, taking full ownership of Churchill Falls, and negotiating the best possible deal for every megawatt of power from Churchill Falls, Muskrat Falls and Gull Island?
871	And finally, Premier Wakeham, you say Newfoundland and Labrador's share of the power and benefits will increase over time but where does the agreement guarantee that our share increases at the same rate, or faster, than Quebec's benefit?
872	Why should Quebec continue receiving the majority of the power and economic benefit from a resource Newfoundland and Labrador owns 65.8% of?
873	If this agreement truly makes Newfoundland and Labrador the primary beneficiary, show us the clause that guarantees it. Why should we sign another 50-year deal where Quebec's benefits are guaranteed, while ours are only promised to increase and risk our children asking in 2077 why we gave Quebec the better deal again?
874	I want to know if signing this deal is ever going to put my electricity costs at the same rate as Quebec residents are paying?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
875	Where can I see the text of the agreement?
876	Why is the current Churchill Falls deal remaining virtually unchanged, when we can wait and have total control in 15 years?
877	If Quebec's power demands never require more than the current amount of power, why would they develop any other projects?
878	What is the deal not based on market value?
879	Why is there no 5-year review of pricing, which is standard in most other power development projects world wide? I am totally against this deal as it is written today and I feel betrayed by both political parties. If this deal is signed, politicians who sign it and agree with it, will go down in history as not very bright.
880	If NL owns Churchill Falls, then why are we not receiving at least 50%?
881	Will consumers get a reduction to their power rates equivalent to or lower than Quebec?
882	Why are we desperate to get a deal in 2026?
883	Why have you not secured a way to sell power to the USA directly instead of having Quebec as a middleman?
884	Does Newfoundland still have majority ownership after this deal is signed completed?
885	Why has Gull Island have to be included in this agreement?
886	What happened to the huge cash settlement that was in the old MOU to justify the unfair agreement done in 1969?
887	As a resident of NL I do not want to see future escalations or distribution being a windfall for Quebec as was the case with the original CF agreement - we deserve to be compensated fairly. What measures are being taken and protections established to ensure: - Future market escalations in power units being sold to/through Quebec are distributed fairly between NL and Quebec?
888	Future transmission capacity downstream for NLs excess power is guaranteed with fixed costs?
889	Gull Island development will occur?
890	Subject wind farm development will occur?
891	If Gull Island and the proposed wind farm do not proceed within a defined timeframe, what is that timeframe?
892	What are the consequences and repercussion to the revised upper CF deal?
893	What is the penalty to Quebec?
894	Why can't we ensure equal power rates for NL and Quebec residents?
895	Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], have stated that MOU2 gives NL more access to 950 MW of electricity, far more than MOU1. Yet, MOU2 delivers no additional energy from the existing Churchill Falls plant. Delivery of the additional energy relies on cost-based rates for Gull Island power and on wind development. Both projects are subject to enormous uncertainty, Hydro-Québec having been given a 12-year option to commission construction, and the commitment to wind is only to conduct a study. In addition, both sources of power, if built, will be many tens of times more expensive than the cheap Churchill Falls power NL is giving to Quebec. Why is Premier misrepresenting what MOU2 contains?
896	Over the period of the 51-year MOU, Quebec will receive about 75% of power production from CF and even more if Gull Island and the wind project do not proceed. Please explain how this lopsided advantage to Quebec benefits Newfoundland and Labrador?
897	Why is expanded Churchill Falls capacity priced on a cost-of-service basis when Newfoundland and Labrador bears 65.8% of the ownership and financing risk, receives a return below 5% and Hydro-Québec receives most of the energy and market-price upside?
898	MOU2 commits virtually all Churchill Falls power to Quebec at a net cost equal to approximately 2.6 cents per kWh (present value). The cost of Gull Island power and wind power are expected to be much higher 12 or more cents per kWh. How does selling the cheap power to Hydro-Québec and maybe gaining access to the most costly power from Gull Island and wind, benefit NL mining, or achieve parity with Quebec ratepayers?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
899	Both Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] have made much of NL having gained wheeling rights for Churchill Falls power. Both refer to four separate blocks of power totaling 985 MW as though NL achieved transmission wheeling rights to external markets for all 985 MW. CBC News confirmed this reading on August 2, quoting [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]: "only up to 265 MW can be moved for direct sales by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro. That block comes under transmission rights the corporation already holds." In other words, this right predated the MOU2. The remaining blocks are also limited by rigorous terms that allow Quebec to prescribe both the rate and the customers of Quebec-Hydro to whom the power must be sold. In contrast, NL does not prescribe for Quebec the price it charges for CF power or to whom its Churchill Falls power should be sold. Why are the Premier and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] misleading the public on this issue?
900	Most people recall that the biggest problem with the 1969 Churchill Falls Contract was that it lacked any provision for increases in the market value of electricity for 65 years, leaving the price a fraction of a cent per kWh for all of that time. Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], have claimed that MOU2 offers indexation based on the Consumer Price Index. Several analysts - Economist [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], CPA, Economist Dr. [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]'s, CPA and others confirm that MOU2 offers little or no protection against inflation. Both [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] state that the new Churchill Falls Inflation Adjustment Mechanism described in Annex F of the Agreement is deceiving because the mechanism is not effective for electricity inflation. They state, as history has confirmed, the proper adjustment mechanism is simply the real escalation rate in the cost of electricity. As our MHA, please describe exactly how Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] assertions are correct, and all those analysts are wrong?
901	Why - recognizing that such "wheeling" rights for electricity, are not free and require payment - did Premier Wakeham not require from Quebec reciprocal transmission rights?
902	The basis for such transmission has been established by "Open Access" rules that the American Government imposes on all sellers of electricity into that market. Why should they not apply to Newfoundland and Labrador?
903	Having failed to obtain, demand, or negotiate transmission rights for our power through Quebec in order to reach third party customers, are you, as an MHA, content that we should be second class citizens in Confederation?
904	Why did the Province accept 60% of Gull Island's financing risk while Quebec receives 86% of the power, controls much of the market-value upside and Newfoundland and Labrador's return is capped below 5%?
905	How does this financing and pricing scheme make any business sense for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?
906	Do you agree that both Premier Furey and Premier Wakeham populated their negotiating committee with people dramatically less experienced than those representing Hydro-Québec?
907	Exhibit "C" of MOU2 prevents the NL Government from adjusting water royalties and other levies for 51 years. Since 1969, NL has earned a pittance from this potentially lucrative source of resource revenue. This concession to Quebec erodes our ability to finance our debt and deliver social programs; it erodes our sovereignty as a province in the process. Why has Premier Wakeham accepted that NLers should benefit so little from our natural resources, in this case the very water that drives the Churchill Falls turbines?
908	Analysts of MOU2 have concluded that most of the energy from Churchill Falls continues to be sold to HQ at a price that starts under 2 cents in 2027, reaching 10.85 cents by 2041, only touching today's replacement cost of 17 cents around 2054. As an MHA, is this your idea of fairness when Premier Wakeham committed that NL would be the "principal beneficiary" of Churchill Falls?
909	For Liberal MHAs, why does Liberal Leader John Hogan, not support NL's right to be the "principal beneficiary" of Churchill Falls?
910	If he does, why did MOU1 not contain those benefits?
911	An additional question for Liberal MHAs: why is Liberal Leader, John Hogan, and his energy critic, Fred Hutton, speaking only about peripheral issues, like use of the CPI Index, and not the whole Memorandum of Understanding when the Independent Review Committee was unequivocable that MOU1 did not make NL the "principal beneficiary" and was not in the interests of the province?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
912	The Independent Review Committee commissioned to study, among other things, whether MOU1 made NL the "principal beneficiary" of Churchill Falls proposed strategic guidance and preparations for the Wakeham Government to follow in preparation for a new series of negotiations with Hydro-Québec. The Report, entitled Creating Long-Term Value from the Churchill River for the People of Newfoundland and Labrador outlined the need to develop a targeted economic vision and strategy, formulate pricing models, and evaluate alternative ownership and operating models for projects like Gull Island. The Wakeham Government ignored the IRC recommendations and set up a new negotiating Committee and commenced negotiations with Hydro-Québec within just days of receiving the Report. Wakeham gave the Committee few guidelines and established no set of principles to establish a minimum floor acceptable to NL in a negotiated outcome. As a Member of the House of Assembly, do you agree that this approach was unprofessional, even reckless, and that it likely contributed to the poor outcome achieved by the negotiating committee?
913	The IRC stated that the inclusion of Churchill Falls, Gull Island, capacity expansion at CF and the transmission projects, tied together obscured the value to NL of each component. Multiple analysts advised Premier Wakeham to "unbundle" the MOU, in part in the interest of transparency, but also so that the value of each component part, individually, could be assessed. Premier Wakeham refused this advice. Taking into account how little MOU2 achieved, do you still support the Agreement?
914	Do you agree that it should run for 51 years?
915	During the last general election Premier Wakeham promised that all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians would have a say over the outcome of any deal with Quebec in a Referendum. He has gone back on his word. Are you prepared to take a stand and advise the Premier to hold a Referendum on the MOU as he promised?
916	Do you plan to support Premier Wakeham's MOU2 during debate in the House of Assembly?
917	Will you vote with the Wakeham Government if Members are asked to indicate their support for the deal?
918	The market value of the annual energy from the existing Church Falls Plant is estimated to be in the $4 to $5 billion range. The 2024 MOU delivers revenues to the provincial Treasury in the amount of about $400 million annually; the new MOU the same. Accounting for full market value for Churchill Falls power which should commence upon the expiry of the 1969 Contract in 2041, how do you justify such a low return to NL when we should receive 100% of net revenue to the extent that it reflects both 65.8% of CFLCo ownership and the value of our water rights?
919	Newfoundland and Labrador has, by far, the highest per capita public debt in Canada. Churchill Falls represents the best opportunity for the province to address this problem, without drastically undermining the current level of public services. The revenue potential from Churchill Falls far outstrips any other to address our debt and deficit. As it stands, MOU2 won't deliver enough revenue to offset the current subsidy given the Muskrat Falls project. Bear in mind that MOU1 and MOU2 transfer $200 billion (Quebec's estimate) to that province over the like of the agreement. The figure will grow as electricity prices increase. Why would an elected member of the House of Assembly agree to rob Newfoundland and Labrador of the opportunity to "fix" its financial position, enhancing Quebec's in the process?
920	I hear in news that NL has to pay more for electricity than Quebec. Explain this?
921	The Churchill Falls Agreement due to expire in 2041 is believed by all to have penalized NL because there was no escalation clause. No matter what the "offsetting" benefits, how is it at all possible that this agreement is a good deal with no escalation clause, particularly given the rapidly changing environment in which we live?
922	Why not hold a referendum?
923	Why the escalation price tied to CPI?
924	Likely better to tie price to a formula tied to a combination of US, Quebec, and NL electricity prices. Who will actually own the facilities?
925	Who will be responsible for maintaining the facilities once built?
926	Is there a backstop for climate change that may impact power generation?
927	Is there no penalty for producing less power than projected for any reason?
928	Does the NL power block take precedence over any reduction in output?
929	Can NL increase their power amount to meet NL requirements?
930	In the event of a legal dispute, are there safeguards preventing the withholding of information?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
931	Why are we tied to selling to Quebec and prevented from selling direct to US market less a reasonable "wheeling fee"?
932	Why not put this MOU through the same detailed review process as the last MOU?
933	Why has Premier Wakeham reneged on his PROMISE?
934	Why is there a need to bundle these projects?
935	Can we just negotiate a new Churchill Falls deal first?
936	All we are negotiating here is our majority owned company's contract with Hydro-Québec to sell them power and at what rate? That has nothing to do with Gull Island. That doesn't mean we don't do Gull Island, it just means we access that project on its own merit.
937	Why does this deal not include a higher water royalty more in line with current industry benchmarks?
938	This is up front money that bypasses any split with Quebec, bypasses NL Hydro, and goes 100% to the provincial government treasury. Currently this deal leaves water royalties exactly as they were in the 1969 deal?
939	What was the rational of removing market rate returns and moving to a fixed payment schedule? The original 1969 deal locked us in to a fixed return for the full deal that amounted to pennies, and while this new deal offers a significantly better fixed return plus inflation adjustments, it's still a fixed schedule for 50 years repeating the same mistake as 1969.
940	What happens if Ottawa steps up and builds its energy corridor right through Quebec and gives us open access to other markets but we are locked into a fixed payment schedule?
941	We own the river and 2/3rds of the production facility, an asset that in itself is worth billions. Why are we settling for what amounts to between 20-30% of the profit potential?
942	Why lock into a 50-year deal with no review mechanism? This is again the same mistake as 1969, less the automatic renewal. A deal could still be amortized and financed for 50 years, but with a shorter term that comes up for review every 5 years having built in mechanisms to ensure the deal doesn't go lopsided like last time. There is no downside to a shorter deal with interim reviews.
943	What happens to this deal in the event that Quebec separates from Canada?
944	What happens if Quebec joins another country? What if NL does?
945	Why can't all the NL Political Parties form ONE negotiating TEAM to work with Federal Government to settle the dispute with NL and Quebec for the sharing of our energy resources with all of Canada, not just for the use of Quebec to sell "back to us" and USA?
946	In the payments to NL, in the escalation clause, why was the overall CPI used rather than being tied to the rates that HQ charges it's customers for power?
947	If their profit goes up, as a result of being able to charge more, then their ability to pay also goes up and NL should be a beneficiary to that. Is there a guaranteed capacity for NL to transmit NL power through QC to third party buyers? If so, at what rate is NL charged for this capacity and is there any guarantee that QC can't raise the transmission charge to effectively make it non-economic for NL to use the capacity?
948	What is the expectation in terms of engineering and construction labour for the projects proposed in the MOU?
949	Will NL be given preference for work being performed within our borders?
950	Will NL businesses be preferred suppliers of goods and services for the projects?
951	Is NL, in a net financial perspective (NPV), better off with this MOU now than if we wait longer, potentially until 2041 and negotiate?
952	If the opinion is YES then how do you know?
953	Has there been any sensitivity analysis done on the potential changes to the financial picture as time passes?
954	If the answer is NO, to any of that, then this is not the right agreement. QC wants a long-term stable purchase price now while it's comfortable for them to negotiate. They will have more incentive to provide a more favourable deal as that time runs out. Is there an opportunity to re-open the agreement if the financial picture changes significantly at some point?
955	As we've seen under the old agreement, we don't have a crystal ball to view future energy prices and given the volatility of oil at the moment as an example, they can go up unexpectedly and seldom come down. What if this deal becomes lopsided in the future?
956	Can we fix it or will we be as stuck as we currently are?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
957	Has any TRULY INDEPENDENT analysis (outside of NL and maybe better if outside of Canada) been done to assess whether this is a good deal for NL versus waiting for 2041 or whether there are improvements to be made in NL's favour?
958	In other words, what are we potentially leaving on the table?
959	What impact, if any, will the questions of the people of NL have on this MOU being ratified?
960	Always talk of new hydro power for NL treasury - Labrador has hydro needs in the west, south, north and central; meanwhile Labradorians are getting fed up with can be interpreted as 'greed' by the province, when after all, hydro is generated using Labrador rivers. Additionally, no mention of an environmental /sociological assessment of 2010, and it was proven to be faulty with Muskrat (Methyl Mercury in our Lake Melville fish.) Really the plan is to completely remove the Grand(Churchill) River from Labrador with the Gull Island initiative - the river is currently a tourist mainstay in the region. And what agreements have been made with the Innu as the Smallwood Reservoir is purported to be able to produce more power when it is already locally known that the water supply in the reservoir is reduced?
961	Divert another precious river? At whose expense? The only thing I applaud is the wind power initiative, which was mentioned years ago, and only acted on now. I remain perplexed as to how this concentration of hydro (CF, Gull, Muskrat) is environmentally going to work, especially on us in central Labrador.
962	Why a 50-year deal?
963	Why low rates?
964	Why are you not listening to people offering different opinions?
965	Electricity rates and fairness to NL ratepayers The Government has announced a 15% Churchill River Electricity Rebate on the first 2,000 kWh of residential electricity consumption per month. Why was 15% selected?
966	Did Government model alternatives such as 20%, 25% or 30%, and, if so, what would each option cost annually?
967	More fundamentally, given that electricity from the Churchill River will contribute to Québec's long-term supply of comparatively inexpensive electricity, why should Newfoundland and Labrador households continue paying substantially higher retail electricity rates while the resource is located principally within Newfoundland and Labrador?
968	I recognize that retail electricity rates in Québec and Newfoundland and Labrador cannot fairly be compared solely by looking at the price per kilowatt-hour. The two provinces have different generating systems, debt structures, transmission costs and customer bases. Nevertheless, shouldn't citizens of the province that owns the resource receive a clearly identifiable and enduring ratepayer benefit from its development?
969	Would Government consider establishing a permanent Churchill River Consumer Dividend or rate-equity mechanism under which a defined portion of Churchill River revenues automatically reduces residential electricity costs, rather than relying upon a rebate whose value could ultimately be changed by a future government?
970	Protecting NL's electricity for economic development Exactly how much firm capacity and annual energy will Newfoundland and Labrador have the unconditional right to use within the province in each major period of the agreement?
971	If electricity demand from Labrador mining, mineral processing, data centres, manufacturing, hydrogen production or other industries substantially exceeds today's forecasts, can NL reclaim additional Churchill River electricity?
972	What prevents Newfoundland and Labrador from finding itself decades from now with enormous hydroelectric resources but insufficient inexpensive electricity to pursue major economic opportunities?
973	Access to outside markets Government has emphasized improved transmission and export opportunities. Will Newfoundland and Labrador have legally enforceable access through Québec to competitive markets such as Ontario, New York and New England?
974	What happens if existing transmission arrangements such as CHPE or NECEC expire, change ownership, are renegotiated or cease operating?
975	Can Government guarantee that NL will receive the economic equivalent of competitive external-market prices after transmission charges, losses, congestion costs and other deductions?
976	Cost overruns and financial risk Who ultimately bears construction cost overruns on Gull Island and the Churchill Falls upgrades?
977	Has Government modelled scenarios in which project costs increase by 25%, 50% and 100%, construction is delayed several years, interest rates rise materially, or export electricity prices fall?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
978	For each scenario, what would be the financial exposure of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, the Provincial Government and NL electricity ratepayers?
979	Given Newfoundland and Labrador's experience with Muskrat Falls, will these stress tests be released publicly before the definitive agreements are approved?
980	Public Utilities Board oversight, the August 17 framework contemplates exemptions from Newfoundland and Labrador Public Utilities Board jurisdiction for certain Churchill River developments. Why is such an exemption necessary?
981	If ordinary PUB oversight will not apply, what independent organization will determine whether expenditures are prudent, protect ratepayers against unreasonable cost overruns or affiliate transactions, and ensure that project costs are not improperly transferred to domestic electricity customers?
982	Governance and Hydro-Québec's multiple roles Hydro-Québec may simultaneously be a major purchaser of electricity, minority shareholder, financier and participant in project development and management. What legally enforceable protections ensure that Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's majority ownership translates into effective control over decisions affecting Newfoundland and Labrador?
983	Which major decisions require NLH's approval, a special majority or unanimous consent?
984	How will conflicts between Hydro-Québec's interests as electricity purchaser and its interests as shareholder, financier or project participant be independently resolved?
985	The true value of the agreement Will Government release sufficient information for independent experts to reproduce the claimed net-present-value benefits of the agreement?
986	Will the financial analysis separately identify: Cash payments and dividends; Value of electricity retained by NL; Export-market value; Federal financial assistance and guarantees; Transmission benefits; Project debt and contingent liabilities; and Economic-development benefits? The public should be able to distinguish between nominal dollars accumulated over many decades and genuine value expressed in today's dollars.
987	Indigenous and Labrador benefits What ownership, revenue-sharing, employment, procurement and governance opportunities will be available to Innu Nation and other affected Indigenous rights-holders?
988	How will Government ensure that Labrador communities receive lasting benefits while also receiving sufficient housing, health care, education, municipal infrastructure and other services to manage the pressures created by these developments?
989	What happens when the agreement ends?
990	What precisely happens when the proposed power purchase arrangements expire?
991	Who will then control the electricity?
992	Does Newfoundland and Labrador obtain unrestricted access to the output of the generating facilities it majority-owns, or are there provisions that could effectively extend Hydro-Québec's preferential access beyond the stated contract period? Given the history of Churchill Falls, this question should be answered explicitly before another multi-generational agreement is signed.
993	Independent review before final approval Finally, will Government commit to releasing the complete definitive agreements, subject only to narrowly necessary commercial redactions, before they become irrevocable?
994	Will an independent expert body assess whether the final agreements follow the Independent Churchill River Review Committee’s recommendations, preserve sufficient power for provincial development, provide fair market access, protect taxpayers and ratepayers and deliver lasting economic and electricity-rate benefits?
995	The pricing seems complicated, and I am afraid that we will be at a disadvantage again. I would be better if NL and PQ shared profit 50%/50% ensuring long-term fairness. Why don't you do something like that?
996	The provinces natural resources belong to the people of NL. Why doesn't government give every resident their share as a percentage of the deal? Send out a royalty check every month.
997	Why is there not an independent review of this particular agreement?
998	Why is there such an emphasis on current jobs as opposed to building a sovereign wealth fund with funds from future revenues?
999	Why is there such a rush to push this deal across the line?
1000	Why is former premier Danny Williams being silent about this particular agreement?
1001	If we were to wait another year, would this be a major issue?
1002	What happened to the escalation clauses?
1003	Why is it that we can only answer?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1004	Ask questions Will there be public opportunities to address this agreement?
1005	Will the agreement eliminate the reliance on diesel generators for power in many Labrador communities?
1006	Does signing the new agreement solidify a commitment to develop the Gull Island project?
1007	Is the federal government's support reliant on signing the agreement as is currently drafted?
1008	We were promised a referendum. Why won't the government keep its promise?
1009	The world has not changed that much since the promise was made. Did the government deliberately lie to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?
1010	How can we trust the government moving forward on this when they have broken such a fundamental promise?
1011	What is the point of a debate in the house of assembly when the government holds a majority, It's merely a whitewash? Let the people vote, as you promised.
1012	Why a 50-year locked in deal and not a deal where rates can be renegotiated every 5-10 years? This is how we were hoodwinked in the original Churchill Falls deal and our government is making the same mistake again. We are nearing the end of the bad deal, 14 years is not that far off, time is on our side. It is better to wait our 1 bad deal than to sign another that will lock us in for another generation to come.
1013	Why will Quebec pay a lower rate than NL residents?
1014	Why was 50 years idea for the old MOU, but no 50 years is a good contract?
1015	Why did the PC's as opposition believe we needed a referendum on any deal, but now that they are in government believe that the promised referendum is not needed?
1016	The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has stated that the agreement provides NL with a net present value of $49 billion. What is the net present value of the MOU for Quebec?
1017	The Churchill Falls generating plant produces approximately 34 terra watt hours of electricity per year. The Government of Quebec's stated replacement cost is 17 cents per kilo watt hour which corresponds to nearly 5.8 billion per year. Considering the above, how can we view 49 billion nominal value to NL as sufficient to consider NL as the primary beneficiary of the MOU?
1018	Why did the negotiating team representing the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador insist on combining the Churchill Falls contract renewal with development of Gull Island when Newfoundland and Labrador does not need Gull Island Power?
1019	Why did the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador not insist that a Labrador infrastructure fund be created with contributions by Quebec as part of this MOU given the significant impacts on the region, and the lack of sustained long-term funding from NL? This was the one opportunity for Labrador to get a dedicated funding stream without having to beg politicians.
1020	What is the basis for increasing NL's access to power?
1021	Have offtakers / new customers been arranged prior?
1022	How will the increase in power allocated to NL translate to more money to the provincial treasury and then into the pockets of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?
1023	No graph is available for the revised Gull Island pricing regime. Why?
1024	CFX has been shelved for the time being pending feasibility studies. What is the timeline for sanctioning CFX?
1025	Gull Island is also pending feasibility studies. What is the timeline for official project sanctioning on that; is there a risk that either partner backs out, and if this were to happen, would the arrangement on the existing Churchill Falls asset change?
1026	CPI-indexed pricing achieves the same nominal goal as market-based pricing, assuming electricity markets do not spiral like they did in the 1970s. What is the economic basis for this decision; what assurances do we have that energy markets will not outstrip inflation over the lifetime of the agreement?
1027	Premier Tony Wakeham announced that the 85% Newfoundland-and-Labrador employment guarantee will now apply not only to Gull Island, but to all of the major projects tied to the agreement - Churchill Falls upgrades, Labrador transmission, and wind development. Priority is to be given to qualified Labrador Innu, then Labradorians, then Newfoundlanders. Trades NL, representing 14 building-trades unions, publicly endorsed the agreement on that basis. Question: Is the 85% NL person-hours requirement a legally enforceable contractual obligation applying separately to Gull Island, Churchill Falls upgrades, transmission and wind, and what remedies apply if the target is not achieved?
1028	What will happen to submitted questions, who will answer them and when will answers be provided?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1029	How are the answers being tracked?
1030	Are queries accepted or good ideas that the population may come up with?
1031	Where is the federal government funding allocated in this deal? Is it mainly for construction, and if so, what percentage?
1032	Why is Newfoundland and Labrador not receiving significantly lower power rates when this should be one of the main reasons the project is proceeding?
1033	Why does the agreement have to be for such a long period?
1034	Why can't the be for shorter periods of time so that it may be revisited to ensure NL is seeing appropriate remuneration and retains some control over profits and projects?
1035	Our children are leaving the province for work and lower cost of living elsewhere in Canada. The kickback benefits to the cost of living in NL from this agreement are minuscule. It seems like there are some harmful parts of the agreement to our current and future populations, like low rates of return and lack of control over rates of return once the agreement is inked. Why are such static rates, low rates, and non-negotiable future rates (financial harms) being included in the agreement?
1036	Young workers and young families need access to a quality education system and quality child care system - those should be part of the agreement. Without quality education there will be no workers to fulfill the promises of economic and industrial growth in the province. Can agreements to better nourish and protect adjacent sectors be included in the agreement?
1037	Will individual families get royalties?
1038	Our province is so resource dense, but the profits and benefits never stay in the province. Can these resource benefits be protected instead of given away?
1039	Are Indigenous communities going to participate in governance?
1040	During Muskrat Falls development there were a lot of wasted natural resources like trees that were piled up and let to rot. Can a requirement be made for all useful materials to be shared with communities to avoid waste?
1041	If it is not possible to reliably transfer power from Muskrat Falls to the island, how on earth are we going to transport power anywhere else? Future success of this deal seems to be based on the possibility of actioning energy-related tasks that are not possible/successful yet.
1042	Premier Wakeham committed that NL would be the "principal beneficiary" of Churchill Falls (specifically the contract as it relates to pricing and energy from the renewal of the existing CF plant that is owned by the people of NL) following his renegotiation of Premier Furey's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU1). Please inform me if his commitment was achieved and the key elements that distinguish this outcome? Besides the paltry 15% electricity rebate?
1043	Neither MOU1 nor MOU2 (Premier Wakeham's deal) requires market prices for Churchill Falls power over the 51-year term. Some analysts estimate NL's revenue from Churchill Falls is less than 30% of market value of our power. In consequence of this deal, NL has agreed to subsidize Quebec ratepayers and Quebec industry for another 51 years. When NL owns 65.8% of CFLCo and the rights to the water that facilitates power generation, too, why has the Wakeham Government agreed to such a lopsided deal?
1044	Both Premier Furey and Premier Wakeham populated their negotiating committee with people dramatically less experienced than those representing Hydro-Québec. Isn't this a compelling enough reason for MOU2 to have an independent review as was done with MOU1?
1045	Will there be a free vote in the HOA, one where all MHA can vote without fear of retribution by the parties for not toeing the party line?
1046	This MOU appears to provide value to thousands of potential NL employees, and big business. What's in it for the remaining hundreds of thousands of citizens of Newfoundland who are finding it difficult to make ends meet? Besides the paltry 15% electricity rebate?
1047	We are in a position of strength while negotiating with Quebec. Why is this being rushed and why aren't we using our position of strength in getting the best deal possible for NL? This is as big a confederation. Please slow down and do it right!
1048	Why no escalation clause?
1049	Why 36 years after expiry in 2041?
1050	Why is there so much emphasis on potential numbers based on wind and GI?
1051	The 5th turbine expansion has no guarantee. Where is the new MOU much better than the old one?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1052	WHY IS THERE NO REVIEW PANEL ON THIS? THIS WILL NOT STAND.
1053	Why was advice to unbundle Churchill Falls, Gull Island, the Churchill Falls expansion and transmission projects refused, and why are the bundled components being committed for 51 years?
1054	Why is the escalation clause not also tied to wholesale electricity prices?
1055	At the end of the day will we be better off financially than we would be if we didn't engage in this agreement; and if we would be better off please explain how?
1056	How can I make an opinion whether the new agreement is good or bad when all I'm seeing is what the Gov of NI is showing us and is not the full agreement?
1057	Can your government ensure that all access to jobs and contracts is given to bona fide companies and not shell partnerships that inflate costs dramatically and create huge cost overruns and waste as with Muskrat Falls?
1058	Why did you promise the people of NL a referendum and then change it. Very dishonest in my opinion?
1059	It looks like Quebec is coming out on top again. Please explain why?
1060	Why is the MOU being debated by the members of the House of Assembly only?
1061	Who are they to decide for the people of NL?
1062	What is this agreement doing for Seniors on fixed incomes?
1063	Why do Quebecers continue to pay cheaper rates for their electricity? It doesn't seem right that Newfoundlanders are paying so much to keep warm.
1064	How exactly is the $49 billion calculated?
1065	What assumptions about electricity prices, inflation, interest rates and exchange rates were used?
1066	How much is actual guaranteed revenue versus projected or potential revenue?
1067	How much money will actually flow to Newfoundland and Labrador each year?
1068	Can the government provide a year-by-year breakdown rather than one large lifetime number?
1069	How much of the $49 billion goes to the provincial treasury, NL Hydro, CFLCo, Quebec or other parties?
1070	What happens if electricity prices are substantially lower than projected?
1071	Who takes the financial risk?
1072	What happens if electricity prices are substantially higher than projected?
1073	Does Newfoundland and Labrador fully participate in the upside?
1074	How much will Newfoundland and Labrador have to borrow to build Gull Island and the Churchill Falls expansion?
1075	What will the total debt and interest cost be? And who ultimately guarantees that debt?
1076	What is the estimated net benefit after construction costs, financing costs, maintenance and operating costs?
1077	The Independent Review Committee specifically raised concerns about long-term value, pricing, debt and whether the province would truly be the principal. Exactly how much Churchill Falls and Gull Island power will be available for use inside Newfoundland and Labrador?
1078	For how many years is that power guaranteed to remain available to the province?
1079	At what price will Newfoundland and Labrador consumers and industries receive that electricity?
1080	Could electricity produced in Labrador ever be exported while Newfoundland and Labrador consumers face shortages or high electricity prices?
1081	Who decides whether the province keeps the power for industrial development or sells it to Quebec/US markets?
1082	Can a future government change that decision, or will it be locked into contractual obligations?
1083	The new deal says the province can retain up to 2,350 MW from Churchill Falls and Gull Island and has greater flexibility to use or sell its allocation. The government says Newfoundland and Labrador will have 985 MW of transmission access. Is that access guaranteed for the entire term of the agreement?
1084	What happens if Quebec's transmission system becomes congested?
1085	Who pays for transmission upgrades and maintenance?
1086	How much revenue will Newfoundland and Labrador actually receive from the 240 MW CHPE and 200 MW NECEC arrangements?
1087	Are there penalties if the promised transmission capacity isn't available?
1088	Can Newfoundland and Labrador independently access other American markets in the future?
1089	What is the current estimated total cost of Gull Island?
1090	What happens if the project goes billions of dollars over budget?
1091	Who pays the cost overruns?
1092	What is the expected completion date?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1093	What is the expected cost per kilowatt-hour of Gull Island power?
1094	Has an independent organization verified that Gull Island is economically viable under different electricity-price scenarios?
1095	What happens if Gull Island is delayed or never built?
1096	Does the province still receive all of the other benefits promised in the agreement?
1097	How much power is actually being set aside for Labrador mining and other industrial development?
1098	Is there a guaranteed amount of electricity for new Labrador businesses, or merely the option to use it?
1099	What specific economic-development projects were included in the government's $49-billion calculation?
1100	How many permanent jobs-not construction jobs-are expected to result?
1101	How many of those jobs are expected to remain in Newfoundland and Labrador after construction ends?
1102	The agreement promises that 85% of person-hours during Gull Island construction will go to Newfoundland and Labrador, with priority for qualified Labrador Innu, Labradorians and Newfoundlanders. What exactly will the Innu Nation receive from these developments?
1103	Will Indigenous participation involve ownership/equity, revenue sharing, employment, contracting-or all of these?
1104	What agreements must be reached with the Innu before construction begins?
1105	Are Indigenous benefits included in the $49-billion calculation, or are they additional?
1106	What role will the Innu have in decision-making about development on the Churchill River?
1107	Who will ultimately control Churchill Falls?
1108	Will Quebec retain any veto or special decision-making powers?
1109	Can Hydro-Québec influence decisions about how Newfoundland and Labrador uses its own power?
1110	What happens if NL Hydro and Hydro-Québec disagree?
1111	What protections prevent another situation similar to the 1969 contract from developing decades from now?
1112	Are there mechanisms to reopen or renegotiate the agreement if energy markets fundamentally change?
1113	Can the public see the complete new agreement before the province legally commits itself?
1114	Which parts of the agreement are legally binding today and which are still subject to negotiation?
1115	What conditions must be met before the deal becomes final?
1116	Will the House of Assembly have to approve the final agreements?
1117	Will there be an independent financial/legal review before final approval?
1118	Will the Auditor General or Consumer Advocate have access to the underlying financial models?
1119	What are the termination provisions if Newfoundland and Labrador determines that the final terms are not in the public interest?
1120	The government has announced a 15% Churchill River Electricity Rebate on the first 2,000 kWh/month for residential ratepayers, estimated at about $351 per year. Is the $351 annual household saving guaranteed for the life of the agreement, or can a future government cancel or change it?
1121	What will happen to electricity rates for households after the rebate ends?
1122	Will businesses, seniors, low-income households and people using electric heat receive additional protection?
1123	How much will the rebate cost the provincial treasury each year, and where will that money come from?
1124	With this new deal how much will Quebec make over the 50 years of this deal how much will Newfoundland make. How much money is the federal government giving Quebec to build the new dam?
1125	How can I understand it if the agreement is not available for me to read?
1126	Can I trust this government to understand the agreement?
1127	Does the government understand that the people of NL feel that they were betrayed by the first agreement and breaking the promise of a revenue only starts the path of distrust?
1128	Where can the public see the entire MOU so as to be fully informed versus just getting the information from politicians?
1129	We were PROMISED a referendum. We voted in an election on that promise. How about living up to that promise?
1130	Why does the MOU not require price adjustments based on the market rate charged by Hydro-Québec?
1131	Why does the agreement not include a mechanism to meaningfully and permanently lower electricity rates for Newfoundland and Labrador customers?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1132	Why isn't there a separate agreement for Churchill Falls alone?
1133	Why is there a confusing multipart agreement that in the end gives QC the lion's share of the revenue and control of OUR RESOURCE for another 50 years?
1134	Why no vote on this as promised, during run up to election?
1135	Without an escalation clause, this is a repeat of the original Smallwood agreement - and worse than the tentative agreement announced by the Liberals. Are the construction jobs for Churchill Falls and the wind project - and any subsequent employment - guaranteed to go to residents of Newfoundland and Labrador and Innu?
1136	This agreement is so favorable to PQ, it does not matter what political party is elected to govern PQ. Thus there is plenty of time to hold the referendum the PC Party guaranteed the people of NL. (4) Given the financial hardships the people of NL are experiencing as a result of current economic uncertainty, why are the direct benefits to residents of this province capped at $360 a year per household in savings on electricity? Please address these questions during the debate in the House. But more importantly, please begin the process of holding a referendum so the people of Newfoundland and Labrador have the opportunity they were promised to accept or reject this agreement.
1137	Why the urgency?
1138	Mr. Premier, when you stated "If we do not go now, we will have another 15 years of zero" but what's another 15 years if we already have been receiving this since 1969. My question is if we wait until 2041 - do NL get to hold all of the cards when it comes to more stock/percentage in ownership of Churchill Falls, and so on. or will it always stay at 65.8%?
1139	Because with Churchill Falls and especially Gull Island (@ 60%) all in NL, why is it we only get to "own" well below three quarters? Thank you for this opportunity.
1140	Why was MOU 2 not sent for an independent review for at least 4 months like the last time?
1141	Why was [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] involved in this negotiation when she sat in OUR house and said MOU - 1 was a great deal?
1142	What happened to our referendum?
1143	Will government hold the referendum on the MOU that was promised during the election campaign?
1144	In this agreement, can Quebec hold up development of Churchill Falls or any other potential power development in Labrador?
1145	Will NL be held to a fixed amount of revenue or will NL's share increase with the increase in the value of hydro power?
1146	Could you please go more in depth about the 'built-in' insurance against volatile inflation and market rates?
1147	Did the Federal Government indicate that they couldn't wait until after a referendum on the new MOU before agreeing to providing funding for the Churchill Falls electrical development?
1148	It will take years/decades to develop Churchill Falls. Why can't you wait 6 months for a thorough review and referendum?
1149	Only 6 months compared to a 50-year deal. With continued projected increases in electricity prices, why can't the MOU be improved again in 6 months,12 months, or 1.5 years, just like the period of time since the last MOU was signed?
1150	What's the rush concluding the agreement?
1151	In line with the PC party platform for the last election under the section on Energy, where it is stated "There can be no deal without "REAL TRANSPARENCY" and that requires a truly independent review". Please explain how it can be "truly independent" when one member of the review committee had previously expressed his objections to the last MOU?
1152	With regard to "real transparency", will you advise of the pros and cons of the current MOU?
1153	What are the cons in particular because we have already heard all the pros?
1154	What are the concessions that we made?
1155	The QC premier said that if NL were to include new provisions then QC would also do likewise. Please advise who benefits more, QC or NL, with the inclusion of a clause regarding Definition of Discrimination Action protection in the current MOU?
1156	If QC asks for this in the MOU how can agreement by NL to this not be a concession?
1157	Has there been mention of this Action by NL Government to date in order to be "truly transparent"?
1158	Can the definitive agreements change the details of the current MOU?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1159	Who, QC or NL, first introduced the idea of determining increases in pricing based on the CPI?
1160	Will QC benefit from market pricing of its own sale of our energy source?
1161	Has NL abdicated it's ability to negotiate for increased market prices for the extra electricity that could be sold to ON, New York or New England by tying us in to only the preside synthetic formula?
1162	What is the opportunity cost of only tying in to this synthetic formula?
1163	When will the House of Assembly reopen after the special session?
1164	Why are there no specific date price re-openers, e.g., every 5 years in the new MOU?
1165	How much of the federal funding is a loan?
1166	Why did you rush feedback in this portal by setting Thursday as the deadline without providing a brief "TRULY TRANSPARENT" public description the Pros and Cons, and concessions?
1167	Why is it being rushed when the Minister of Energy himself said he would not have the exact answers that are required for the public to understand this development?
1168	How can we have informed questions to be submitted now?
1169	How can you rush the Agreement if you admit you don't have the exact answers to questions? Thank you Concerned citizen of NL, my concerned children and grandchildren, for the next 50 years.
1170	Can you explain to me why Quebec residents have such a lower rate than Newfoundland residents?
1171	Following the announcement there were comments of concern that the agreement does not allow NL to gain the benefit of increased revenue that should come from future changes in market demand, is this a real concern that exists in the proposed agreement?
1172	Will government make low electricity rates for Newfoundland and Labrador residents and businesses a priority to attract people and investment, rather than relying primarily on the proposed 15% rebate?
1173	And NL once again trades off long-term royalties for short-term jobs. Imagine the jobs a royalty regime that favours NL could create. Why in God's name are you doing this to us again? Even if you personally believe in the deal, you have an obligation to represent the people's wishes. There must be a fix somewhere.
1174	My equal billing on my power bill is going up $75.00 a month, the 3 cent savings does absolutely nothing to help me, Why only 3 cents, and why only savings up to around 2000 kWh?
1175	Why not let the people of Newfoundland and Labrador vote on the new deal?
1176	Its our resource and we should be paying the same for power 8 cents, why are we paying so much for power?
1177	What environmental impacts associated with Muskrat Falls were underestimated, unexpected or inadequately monitored, and how will those lessons be incorporated into decisions about further development of the Churchill River?
1178	How has the government incorporated climate change and changing river-flow patterns into its assessment of further Churchill River development?
1179	In particular, what happens if future river flows, precipitation and extreme-weather events differ significantly from historical conditions on which previous assessments were based?
1180	What happens if price of electricity increases dramatically during the years of this contract, will our cut go up proportionally?
1181	Will we be allowed to sell power to other jurisdictions via our link or by having power go through Quebec?
1182	If we can sell via Quebec, what protection do we have against them closing this door in future years?
1183	Will we have cheaper power than the people we are selling it to? Or, will we still be paying higher prices despite the fact that it is produced here in our own province?
1184	Does the agreement contemplate or provide for AI or data-centre load in Labrador?
1185	Were any such prospects considered in negotiating it, and has any AI or data-centre company been in contact with the province, NL Hydro, CF(L)Co, the Independent Review Committee, the negotiating team, or anyone acting on their behalf about Labrador?
1186	What was the nature and result of this contact?
1187	If the market price of firm power rises substantially over the term of this agreement, what share of that increase flows to Newfoundland and Labrador?
1188	To what authoritative reference is the price pegged: a published market index (which one, from which jurisdiction), Hydro-Québec's own realized sale prices, a fixed escalator, or something else?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1189	The release says the province will maintain "complete optionality" over its allotted power from the Churchill Falls base plant. Over how many gigawatts does that optionality extend, does it include the province's share of Gull Island, and is it free of any CF(L)Co board approval, Hydro-Québec consent, or routing through Quebec transmission?
1190	What does the province intend to do with the power it retains under this agreement: what in-province uses, in what quantities, on what timeline?
1191	For what term does any exclusivity provision run, restricting the province, NL Hydro, or CF(L)Co from discussing or contracting with parties other than Hydro-Québec regarding Labrador power or resources?
1192	From what date to what date, does it extend or renew automatically, and does it apply to in-province offtake as well as export?
1193	Was the Churchill Falls Extension removed from this agreement? If so, who holds the rights to develop it, and does anything in the agreement restrict its development for in-province use?
1194	Of the power retained under this agreement, how many gigawatts are firm and deliverable at a Labrador delivery point, in each year of the agreement's first decade?
1195	Is the province's retained power under this agreement subject to recall or curtailment for other load?
1196	Under what conditions?
1197	Does the agreement require any approval, from Hydro-Québec, CF(L)Co, or any regulator, before the province may contract retained power to a Labrador load or connect that load directly at a generation site?
1198	Did the province, NL Hydro, or the negotiating team analyze alternatives to the Hydro-Québec-anchored structure before negotiating this agreement?
1199	Will that analysis be tabled?
1200	Do the definitive agreements give Hydro-Québec any exclusive right, right of first refusal, option, or consent right over Gull Island or other undeveloped Labrador hydro?
1201	Does anything in the agreement restrict the province from licensing independent, privately financed development?
1202	Is Gull Island's ownership and financing structure fixed under this agreement, or could a private buyer finance the project, hold equity in it, or fund additional capacity in exchange for behind-the-meter offtake?
1203	Does anything in the agreement prevent that?
1204	Does the agreement commit any Muskrat Falls output to export or to Hydro-Québec, or grant Hydro-Québec any rights over Muskrat Falls or the Labrador-Island Link?
1205	Does this agreement decrease the amount of Muskrat Falls power available to the province?
1206	On what specific dates, or upon what specific events, under the new power purchase agreements can Churchill Falls output committed to Hydro-Québec be redirected to a Labrador offtaker?
1207	At each such point, what contractual terms or CF(L)Co governance provisions or otherwise would prevent that redirection?
1208	What does the agreement provide regarding Innu Nation consent, partnership, or approval rights for Gull Island and the new transmission?
1209	Did the province, NL Hydro, or the negotiating team use AI systems in evaluating this agreement? If so, what did that evaluation find?
1210	Is this deal more concerned with the amount of Power that NL can keep in the province in order to generate and enhance new and old business for the benefit of the province, more so that to see what the province can sell abroad?
1211	To get a bottom line figure, which I'm sure most people of Newfound and Labrador are interested in, has an % been ascertained by considering all financial factors such as to give an idea of what the province can expect annually from the deal? (i.e., QUE 60%/ NL 40%).
1212	I want to know why Quebec is paying a lower rate than NL. I want to know what the government is doing to address seniors and the working poor who are unable to pay their light bills. What subsidies are you going to make available?
1213	I also want to know why you promised a referendum in your election campaigned when you did not have the time or resources to carry one out, I knew this as soon as it was promised but other less informed individuals really believed it was something that could be accomplished. How are you holding yourselves accountable for breaking that promise?
1214	How will you ensure that in future you do not promise things that are not possible?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1215	The Leblanc inquiry GUARANTEED Newfoundlanders' independent analysis of any huge deal. The government cannot be ITS OWN JUDGE. That's an obvious betrayal of what's there to protect us all. Do we let the one just released, still under suspicion be their own parole officer? Certainly not.
1216	Why did Tony lie about having a referendum on any deal on the CF river?
1217	Was it just an election ploy?
1218	What happened to the referendum that Mr. Wakeham said would occur before any deal was signed? Where is the transparency for the people of this province?
1219	On pricing itself, wondering if any market valuation exists at all?
1220	How does 7.4 cents/kW in 2027 and 32.6 cents by 2078 actually compare to current wholesale and export prices in ON NY and NE?
1221	What is the rationale for NL Hydro taking ownership and the associated debt for assets that Hydro-Québec constructs and was the cost-sharing structure proportional to each party's power allocation ever on the table?
1222	When [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], assisted in the negotiation of the 2024 CF MOU, she said words to the effect that it was the best possible deal available with Quebec. Now that she has assisted in the negotiation of a new 2026 CF Deal, she says this one is the best deal available. Yet the deal leaves a lot to be desired and renegotiated. How can she be trusted to negotiate any type of deal on behalf of NL Hydro and the people of NL and Lab?
1223	Should her inability to negotiate be the reason for her dismissal?
1224	Why bundle Churchill Falls upgrades, the development of Gull Island, transmission infrastructure, and onshore wind in one agreement?
1225	Why not have NLH conduct a feasibility study for onshore wind separate from this agreement?
1226	Could a power purchase agreement not be pursued for other electricity generation projects separate from this deal?
1227	Why is the term of the new CF PPA 50 years?
1228	Why were the Innu not included as partners in the creation of this deal?
1229	How will the Province uphold the duty to consult Indigenous peoples; and allow for free, prior, and informed consent?
1230	How will communities in Labrador be supported throughout the various developments?
1231	Will greater resources be provided to support local infrastructure, health care services, and so on?
1232	When will the specific details on engineering, project management, construction and assembly jobs (i.e., timeline, training/skill requirements, exact number of roles, accessibility measures, etc.) be provided?
1233	How will workers be supported to take advantage of these jobs and local companies supported to take advantage of opportunities across the supply chain; what resources or supports will the Province provide?
1234	Outside of jobs, how will the people of Newfoundland and Labrador benefit from this agreement?
1235	How will the revenue be used to support the everyday lives of people and critical community infrastructure?
1236	How will this deal support energy security across Newfoundland and Labrador?
1237	Will revenue support advanced and increased transmission infrastructure within the province?
1238	The 15% power rebate is trivial. Will the Province implement real energy cost savings for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, especially considering that Quebec has lower electricity rates while also selling energy generated in our province?
1239	What is the net present value of the new proposed deal compared to the liberal deal compared to the existing agreement.show the assumptions used in each NPV calculation?
1240	Why does it seem every resource that Newfoundland owns they give away?
1241	Will there be a referendum? If not, will Tony Wakeham resign?
1242	Do the PC party think that Newfoundland and Labradorians are Idiots?
1243	Will we be paying 8 cents per kWh as Quebec is paying for electricity?
1244	Why are they signing a 51-year deal?
1245	I would like to know why we pay double per kilowatt compared to Quebec? This agreement should offer more to Newfoundland than a $350 payout, it seems to me that this is a distraction for people not to question what is in the agreement. Then the PUB will give us a rate increase, this is not a good agreement for me. I also heard about jobs, jobs, jobs but what about us seniors who are struggling already with high power bills, this agreement will not be much of a benefit for me.

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1246	Why are we agreeing to any long-term agreements?
1247	Why can't it be open to review every five years or so in order to be able to address issues regularly?
1248	Why is the agreement being rushed?
1249	Why are people of Quebec getting a much lower rate of electricity than us Newfoundland & Labradorians?
1250	I do not agree that you have done enough. I find it insulting that you (this administration) would think that we would accept your word given the consistent inaccurate information. Even former employees of Quebec Hydro say it is the same deal. Give it time to decipher an MOU that was clearly written by Quebec. What is the hurry? A $350.00 annual rebate on electricity will not save you in the next election.
1251	Didn't our premier get elected on a promise of a referendum over Churchill Falls?
1252	My Question is the 15% rebate. We get our bill for usage plus tax so we pay tax on what we use so you collect $15 for every $100 so it is costing us $115. We get a rebate on the 100 we still pay tax on the 100. Government gets $15 in taxes. So the fact of the matter we save $2.75 per 100. So tell me where is this number you came up with?
1253	Why is it that the new agreement for Churchill Falls not include having Newfoundland residents on the island at same and equal price per kWh as that of Quebec residents, where as Quebec residents only paid a all in blended rate of 8.3 cents per kWh and Newfoundland island residents are paying 15.587 cents per kWh?
1254	An agreement like the new Churchill Falls MOU cannot be summarized in a single question, so I ask to have the following points clarified: Why is the CF renegotiations tied to other developments?
1255	Can it not be negotiated on its own terms and other projects later?
1256	Why are we not receiving a simple base rate on power sold to Quebec at a rate fair to both parties (say 50% of their self-stated replacement cost of 17 cents)?
1257	Why do we not tie rates to simple inflation, pegged to the CPI?
1258	Why do we not have a simple escalator clause tied to energy price indexes?
1259	Why is the agreement for 50 years when 25 years is the international standard for energy agreements?
1260	Why did government rely on its existing internal team rather than establish the independent negotiating structure and external expertise recommended by the Independent Review Committee, and will it disclose the advisors retained, their relevant experience and any written fair-value opinion?
1261	How did government define and rank the objectives of the “best deal,” and did it prioritize near-term employment over long-term financial and equity value?
1262	Why did Newfoundland and Labrador give up the market-price linkage contemplated in the 2024 MOU, who receives the upside if electricity prices rise, and will government publish its wholesale-price forecasts against the agreement’s pricing schedule?
1263	Why does the agreement retain only 500 MW of post-2041 growth and a 15-year supply gap, how is that consistent with industrial growth plans, and when will the Churchill Falls–Labrador West transmission line be sanctioned and operational?
1264	Why is Newfoundland and Labrador entering Gull Island with 60% equity, 16% of the power and limited control, and will government publish its alternative-ownership analysis and reasons for not negotiating Gull Island separately?
1265	Why are the agreement’s binding provisions concentrated on Newfoundland and Labrador, what provincial laws must be amended or overridden, and what compensation or policy risks could this create for future legislatures?
1266	What can this public consultation change, will the House of Assembly have a free vote on the final agreements, and what approvals are required before the material terms become binding?
1267	Why can't we have a 25-year deal for just Churchill Falls?
1268	Where's our referendum?
1269	Why is this MOU so confusing and complicated for the average person to understand? I feel the agreement should be easily understood by a large majority of the local population.
1270	Why does the MOU have three projects put under one agreement? I would like to see the Wind project, and Gull Island Project as separate agreements.
1271	Why is the length of the agreement so long? I feel the agreement should be 25 years and reviewed at the midpoint of the agreement. Whatever length is chosen, I feel the agreement should reviewed at set intervals and adjustments made for each side on expenditures and profits.

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1272	Why does Newfoundland have so little power to sell compared to Quebec? The transmission lines in Quebec are no more important than the water from our River.
1273	Why not have a referenda to decide this MOU?
1274	Why have this short timeline to make a decision on this MOU?
1275	It's way too important. Why not walk away from this offer now from Quebec? (Mark Carney). And look at three separate agreements in the future.
1276	There is something seriously wrong with any draft MOU agreement that is supposed to be so complicated it cannot be easily understood or explained to the citizen of Newfoundland and Labrador. Although there are many differing opinions on this MOU, at the end of the day, it appears this province is far from being the principal beneficiary of the energy we currently own. Why are we not the principle beneficiaries?
1277	Too much power seems to be in the hands of Hydro-Québec. Our present government and NL Hydro should not approve this agreement and instead should return to the negotiating table and draft an agreement that does not include new construction, increased capacity projects, wind energy, and other possibilities that muddy the waters and leave major control in the hands of Hydro-Québec. How does the present agreement address a fair price for power, a fair price escalator, an inflation adjustment, a corridor of unlimited power with fair compensation to Hydro-Québec for use of the power and the ability to access a portion of the power for our residents or industrial customers?
1278	How do you justify a fifty-one year old deal that has insufficient review periods and gives no consideration for market pricing adjustment etc?
1279	The following questions identified by [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], must be answered in the house: Why did Premier Wakeham agree to allow Hydro-Québec 40% ownership in Gull Island when Newfoundland and Labrador will have to bear 60% of the borrowing risk and equity contribution even as Quebec receives 86% of the power?
1280	Do they agree that it should run for 51 years?
1281	[IDENTIFIER REDACTED] gave a good summary of his perspective. The key components to consider in making presentations are the volumes of energy, the pricing and present value of energy, the term of the contract, the new restrictions on NL, and the transmission access through Hydro-Québec (HQ). Why has our government claimed it is getting more energy?
1282	The government secures more energy from the Gull Island (GI) development, if HQ decides it is economical to develop GI. There is no extra power from CF for NL. In fact, if GI does not get built by HQ, then NL's allocation of energy from CF will increase by only 300 MW, to 825 MW. We will not get the additional energy to 1630 MW government has been stating. This was reported by the IRC in its review to be "an unacceptable risk". Government has done nothing to change our allocation of low cost CF energy under MOU Why is that so?
1283	Does every MHA understand the agreement enough to be able to answer all the questions posed in my submission and state why they support or do not the agreement? If not, then further time for education, analysis and discussions in the house are needed. The province should be prepared to walk away from this agreement. The province should not be supporting the MOU as it is currently written. short-term benefits that result in long-term losses for this province are not acceptable. Neither does partisan politics have a place in this important issue. Why can't you take the draft agreement and have external, neutral experienced experts and negotiators do a further review?
1284	Are the long-term effects and costs of this project built into the MOU or are they left for the taxpayers to pick up later?
1285	Is the rate-mitigation actually build into the text of the agreement, ensuring Newfoundlanders will benefit from this project?
1286	Why is there no independent review as required with the original MOU?
1287	Why would you agree to a 50-year deal? Just as bad as the last time. The 15% reduction in electricity rate appears to be a political stunt and should not go forward. Get a better price for the energy and reduce the income tax. Not honouring an election promise shows that a politician's word is worthless.
1288	What is Quebec getting from the deal?
1289	Why are full details of the agreement not being shared?
1290	Why is Quebec getting a better deal that NL when we are the stakeholders?
1291	What is the government not following through with the election promise?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1292	Why does it feel that details are being hidden?
1293	Why is there such a rush to sign this agreement?
1294	Why is only 45 minutes of questioning being offered as that is not enough time to dissect the deal?
1295	Why are you agreeing to their terms when now we are clearly in driver's seat and we need cheaper hydro rates in nl to make this appealing for us at all. We want a vote on this issue as you promised?
1296	Which of the following entities did the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and/or CFLCo (the Proponents) engage with to explore possible commercial arrangements for the sale of Labrador hydro power upon expiration of the current 1969 agreement with Hydro-Québec (HQ), and what was the nature of those discussions: Nova Scotia Power, NB Power, Maritime Electric, Hydro One, and/or any utilities that are members of ISO-NE, NYISO or PJM?
1297	Under FERC regulation, because HQ sells power in federally regulated US wholesale power markets, HQ must offer non-discriminatory access to its transmission facilities under an Open Access Transmission Tariff (OATT). The HQ transmission facilities that carry Upper Churchill power to southern Quebec were purpose built for that specific purpose, and would become surplus, unused transmission capacity in 2041, unless HQ builds new generation near Labrador before then at a cost that is today estimated to exceed 16 cents per kilowatt hour. Did the Proponents consult FERC counsel prior to engaging in discussions with HQ regarding the replacement of the 1969 agreement, to seek advice on reserving capacity on HQ's transmission facilities from the Upper Churchill to southern Quebec under HQ's OATT upon the expiration of the 1969 agreement, and if so, what is the name of the FERC counsel so consulted, and what was the essence of the advice provided by FERC counsel?
1298	If no FERC counsel was consulted, why not?
1299	Monopsony arrangements, such as the 1969 agreement, and that currently proposed by the Proponents, provides the sole buyer (HQ) with market power because it denies the seller the opportunity to do business with alternate buyers who would be prepared to pay a higher price, and are fundamentally anti-competitive. Do the Proponents take the position that continuation of the monopsony as currently proposed is more financially advantageous to the people of NL than if Labrador power could be sold in the open market to the highest bidder using (I) reserved capacity under HQ's OATT or (ii) over new investor-owned transmission between Labrador and the Maritimes?
1300	Did the Proponents fully investigate the possibility of having new private investor-owned transmission capacity built to transmit Labrador power through the Maritimes and interconnecting with the US power grid as of 2041, and if so, which potential investors were discussions held with, and when?
1301	Did the Proponents explore the possibility of partnering with private investors to develop the proposed Upper Churchill expansions, Gull Island and/or the required new associated transmission facilities under long-term build/operate/transfer or similar commercial arrangements, and if so, which potential investors did the Proponent hold discussions with, and when?
1302	Is it not illogical to claim the proposed agreement with HQ is the best deal possible for NL if no other potential counterparties or commercial arrangements were seriously considered? If it is not illogical, please explain.
1303	The rate to be paid by HQ for electricity purchased under the proposal is significantly below current power rates in Atlantic Canada, Ontario and the Northeastern US. Further, no escalator exists to ensure the rate to be paid by HQ will ever reach what the commodity is actually worth, especially given that wholesale electricity rates are expected to increase significantly (more than general inflation) over the next 10-20 years, especially in the US. HQ has publicly stated that the proposed power pricing will provide HQ with over $200 billion in savings over the term of the agreement (which will pay for a significant portions of HQ's own capital investment over the coming decades). Why is it fair to the people of NL, who should be the beneficiaries of this resource, that the proposed agreement will provide a direct financial transfer of over $200 billion from NL to HQ?
1304	Why shouldn't HQ pay either what the commodity is worth, or at minimum, what the least cost alternative would be?
1305	Much has been made of the provisions under which the Proponents can force HQ to purchase unused NL-designated power at 150% of the highly-discounted base cost that HQ would otherwise pay. Why wouldn't such purchases be priced at prevailing market rates in either the Maritimes or the Northeast US, as that is what HQ would receive for any surplus power they sold in such markets?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1306	The Proponents indicate they will have the right to transmit up to 985 MW of power through HQ's transmission facilities. Under this transmission arrangement, where does title to the power transfer from the Proponents to HQ?
1307	Why has the Proponent not been permitted to conduct its own sales to off-takers over this facility instead of having HQ control this process?
1308	Does this not provide HQ with access to the Proponent's sensitive commercial information that could be used by HQ for anti-competitive purposes?
1309	Do the Proponents consider it prudent to allow the government of another province (let alone one that has exploited NL for the past five decades) to hold significant equity ownership positions in critical NL energy infrastructure, particularly where such ownership in the Upper Churchill assets has resulted in a dysfunctional governance structure where the asset is operated virtually exclusively for the benefit of the minority shareholder?
1310	Does the past conduct of HQ vis-a-vis the Upper Churchill agreement and the vast profits it has made from this NL resource instill confidence that HQ is an honourable and trustworthy partner to undertake another 50-year commercial agreement with?
1311	What kind of conduct would be required for the Proponents to consider HQ NOT honourable or trustworthy as a partner?
1312	Does the proposed agreement require HQ to share with the Proponents profits earned from reselling cheap power obtained through this arrangement at much higher prices?
1313	It is one thing to provide power at low rates to a partner to meet its own energy requirements, but it is another thing altogether to serve as a source of windfall profits for HQ by reselling power it doesn't need. Why is it prudent or appropriate that the people of NL not share in any such windfall profits?
1314	The early-year accelerated payments to NL under the proposal have a "payday loan" feel to them. If the proposed agreement with HQ does not proceed, how will this affect the projected budget deficits of the Government of NL over the next 10 years?
1315	Will our power price ever come close to as low as Quebec's?
1316	How is this better than the deal under the liberals?
1317	Under the proposed MOU the Province was to be paid $1 billion annually from Hydro-Québec; revenue that could be used to pay down the deficit. Is there any provision for upfront cash in this updated MOU?
1318	The new proposal allows the Province to export up to 800 MW of power through Hydro-Québec's transmission lines. Assuming those lines are near capacity, who will pay for any required upgrades?
1319	Is there a strategic plan and economic framework that outlines the value of the current Churchill River capital assets and the potential asset value for recapitalization and expansion of assets for NL and Canada?
1320	Is there a strategic plan that outlines the economic development opportunities of expanded electricity assets and production of new assets that support current and future mining operations in Labrador and reduced electricity costs to Newfoundland island ratepayers?
1321	Will government provide a side-by-side comparison of the two MOUs?
1322	Isn't totally anti-democratic to lock all future governments to a 50-year deal WITH NO review mechanism?
1323	The Quebec government is gloating that it is getting a supply of hydro at an incredibly low price which secures Quebec 's economy for the next 50 years, why have you not the same to offer?
1324	Why isn't this deal means a SUBSTANTIAL reduction of Newfoundlanders hydro bills?
1325	Why have you not released ALL the terms of the MOU?
1326	You PROMISED a referendum, when?
1327	Why can't we avoid making a deal for now?
1328	Why is government focused on temporary job creation rather than long-term provincial wealth and well-being for the province and the province's people?
1329	Why does the deal have to be complicated?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1330	Why can't we complete a simple deal, including A fair price for the electricity that still allows Quebec to make a profit from reselling it or using it in their own economy?
1331	An ability to increase the price with inflation, tied directly to CPI calculated by the BOC. A mechanism to increase the price with rising energy costs, within reason, reviewed every 5 years. The ability for Newfoundland and Labrador to access up to 20% of current generation capacity at Churchill Falls. A 25-year term. Why isn't Labrador completely provided for in this deal? Including affordable and reliable power.
1332	The 1969 Churchill Falls agreement called for any contract disputes to be settled in the Quebec courts. Will disputes in the new contract be settled in the Newfoundland and Labrador courts or the Quebec courts?
1333	Since the agreement won't be completed until the end of December, if at all, we still have time to hold the referendum on the agreement, which was an election promise to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. Can we still have the referendum?
1334	The Gull Island part of the agreement has many problems, including Quebec's large ownership share of it. This ownership won't last 50 years, but forever. Before the final contract is signed, can we reduce Quebec's ownership in Gull Island?
1335	Why is Churchill Falls, Churchill Falls expansion, Gull Island and the wind energy project being negotiated altogether?
1336	These are all separate entities and what side wanted them grouped together?
1337	Why is this a 50-year deal and how does such a long deal benefit NL?
1338	Why are our electricity rates not being reduced?
1339	Why are we not waiting until 2041 to regain a major stake in Churchill Falls when Gull Islands completion will be close to that date?
1340	Why are we letting Quebec dictate our timeline with regards to this deal?
1341	Quebec itself said publicly that any alternative will cost them almost three times as much. Why does the government not want an impartial third party group of experts to analyze this deal to see if it gives NL the maximum benefits?
1342	Why are the benefits to NL after the short-term jobs have ended?
1343	Construction jobs do not last 20, 30 or 40 years. How will future generations benefit from this deal?
1344	Where are the funds coming from to support the rebate program and is the rebate contingent on this deal going through?
1345	Why was the referendum canceled when most people voted for you based on that promise?
1346	Do you think the vast majority of NLers are supporting this deal?
1347	Does the government monitor social media and know about the backlash that exists with this deal?
1348	Do you realize how much history there is with the previous deal and how it has affected generations of NLers?
1349	Many people feel that we are heading in the same direction. Is this accurate?
1350	Has anyone in government bothered to read [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]'s posts that contains an enormous amount of information and describes this deal as not in the best interest for NL?
1351	Can you honor a referendum as promised?
1352	Can you make the CF MOA simpler and easier to understand?
1353	Can you consider residential electricity rates on par as enjoyed by Quebec residents?
1354	Can you have more thorough assessment before legislating?
1355	Why aren't questions submitted by the public displayed openly on Facebook for everyone to see?
1356	Why must people enter a logged-in area to submit questions, where nobody else can see what was asked or whether it was answered?
1357	Will you hold a live, public question-and-answer session where residents can ask questions directly and receive clear answers-not prepared talking points?
1358	Before the election, you promised a referendum on the Churchill River agreement. Will you honour that promise?
1359	If there will be no referendum, what changed after the election-and why shouldn't the people have the final say on an agreement lasting generations?
1360	Will the complete agreement, including its financial assumptions, risk assessments and independent legal advice, be released before any binding decision is made?
1361	Where does the agreement specifically guarantee lower electricity rates for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1362	Why shouldn't Newfoundlanders and Labradorians pay the same electricity rates as Quebec-or less-when the power comes from our resources?
1363	What will the average household actually save each month, and when will those savings appear on electricity bills?
1364	Will Newfoundland and Labrador be the primary beneficiary of its own resources, as you promised? Please show us the numbers proving it.
1365	Why enter another approximately 50-year agreement rather than require full review and renegotiation every 10 years?
1366	Are the prices and revenues protected against inflation and future increases in the market value of electricity?
1367	Where is that protection written into the agreement?
1368	If Canadian or American electricity prices double or triple, will Newfoundland and Labrador receive its fair share of that increased value?
1369	Why is there an apparent rush to complete negotiations?
1370	What is the actual deadline, who established it and what specifically happens if it is missed?
1371	Why not negotiate an interim agreement that expires in 2041, when Newfoundland and Labrador's position and leverage may be much stronger?
1372	In 2041, Newfoundland and Labrador is expected to control a much larger share of the existing Churchill Falls operation. Why is Gull Island development necessary before then?
1373	What percentage of ownership, profits, jobs and decision-making authority will belong to Newfoundland and Labrador compared with Quebec?
1374	How many construction and permanent jobs will be guaranteed to residents of Newfoundland and Labrador, and will wages and working conditions be equal?
1375	Who is responsible for cost overruns, delays and unexpected financial losses?
1376	Could those costs eventually be passed on to Newfoundland and Labrador ratepayers?
1377	Will residents on the Island and in Labrador benefit equally, or could one region carry costs without receiving a fair share of the benefits?
1378	Why can't some of the profits be returned directly to residents through lower electricity rates, rebates or a resource dividend?
1379	Has an independent panel of energy, financial and legal experts-separate from the government and the negotiating parties-evaluated the agreement? If so, will its complete findings be released?
1380	What alternatives were seriously examined, including waiting, building our own transmission route or pursuing direct access to other Canadian and American markets?
1381	What protections allow Newfoundland and Labrador to reopen or leave the agreement if market conditions change or the promised benefits fail to materialize?
1382	Will you answer these questions publicly, live and without screening out the difficult ones?
1383	Is this another 50-year agreement for the sale of our electricity that is not based on market prices? It appears to be—why?
1384	If Quebec decides not to develop Gull Island, will it have access to ten times as much of our electricity as Newfoundland and Labrador?
1385	Is there anything in this agreement which gives us the RIGHT to use current existing transmission lines through Quebec to sell our electricity to other markets: for example, to the US?
1386	Why are Newfoundlanders given higher rate than people from Quebec?
1387	I try to keep my Hydro cost down always a 2000 kWh incentive doesn't affect me. I don't use that much in a month. Why can't it just be a reduced rate across the board for homeowners?
1388	Is there going to be inflation Incorporated into what Quebec is being charged?
1389	Will Newfoundland actually be able to sell electricity to other provinces or to other countries?
1390	I don't believe there should be a referendum. We are not knowledgeable about every detail, but I do think more transparency and clear information regarding the motivation behind some of the changes in the contracts would be beneficial. Are the changes to the contract truly beneficial to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians? Or is it going to be the same contract with slight inflation changes and we have lost our autonomy?
1391	Are you going to make any changes because of these questions?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1392	If CF(L)Co. is the entity selling our excess power to Quebec does Hydro-Québec get to keep their 34% of our returns due to ownership of 34% of CF(L)C0? Why not have NL Hydro be the entity selling the power?
1393	We need 50 percent rebate not 15! How come we are always getting the small end of benefits from mega project?
1394	How soon will it be started, time to get this going?
1395	Why do you think that reneging on your election promise to put this decision to a referendum is ok? It calls into question the validity of your claims about the benefits of this proposed deal to NI which are vague at best and worse it calls into question the integrity of the PC party.
1396	Quebecers pay about 5.5 cents per kilowatt hour. Newfoundlanders pay over 16 cents per kilowatt hour. The proposed 15% rebate reduced our electricity cost by 2.5 cents. That's 14 cents versus 5.5 cents that Quebecers pay. We pay nearly 3 times what Quebecers pay. This is an injustice. Why are we not paying 5.5 cents per kilowatt hour?
1397	Why are we now rushing to get this deal done as you stated we should not be?
1398	Why are we still paying higher rates for our power while Quebec is gushing about their great deal, we the owners of this power are paying higher rates? The math is not matching.
1399	Why is the agreement for 50 years?
1400	Too long. Why can't we have a 15-year term and then renegotiate a new deal?
1401	Does the MOU still have opt out clauses or is it locked in for 50 years?
1402	How is the built in rate increases any different than the escalator clause of the previous MOU?
1403	what's to prevent a situation similar to the old deal in which say in 2060 we are getting paid $0.15/kWh when the market rate is $0.30/kWh?
1404	Why are the people of NL not the primary beneficiaries of this agreement?
1405	Why not require market-based pricing?
1406	Why not separate Churchill Falls from the deal, we own it and should use all available power for our use when the contract expires?
1407	Why are you going to sign a 51-year deal without scheduled review periods to re-examine market conditions that will benefit the province?
1408	Why are you saying we have the right to transmit power over Quebec lines when we don't?
1409	Why are you giving up our right to adjust our water royalties?
1410	Why are you refusing to have an independent review of this MOU, if it is so great what do you have to fear?
1411	Should the agreement be for a 25-year period rather than a 50-year term? There were many mistakes in the original first agreement that could have been dealt with if there was a shorter original 100-year term as signed by [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] Smallwood.
1412	Why are we paying more for electricity then Quebec, it should be more even?
1413	Why are we paying more to build Gull Island?
1414	Why is it so important to sign a contract for 50 years?
1415	Will we (NL&LABR) be permitted to transport our energy through Quebec to reach the US border, and if so, what terms and rates will be applied?
1416	What is the first significant benefit that NL&LABR taxpayers will experience once the contract is signed, and when can we expect to feel it?
1417	What is the single most significant risk to the taxpayers of NL&LABR if we decide not to sign the contract and wait it out (so to speak)?
1418	Can we please slow down the train and let the people with the right being taken away given a chance to speak?
1419	How will NL be able to sell electricity to the US at rates not set by Quebec?
1420	How will NL be able to sell electricity to others in Canada if Quebec refuses access to or use of its infrastructure?
1421	What happens to the deal if Quebec separates?
1422	If there is to be so much anticipated surplus electricity, why do Newfoundlanders pay more per kWh than Quebecers pay?
1423	If an agreement is reached is the old agreement null a void, and what is the new rate for the old agreement?
1424	Premier Wakeham, your government has described the Churchill River as presenting significant economic opportunities. But what is the government's responsibility to determine whether there is also a point beyond which further alteration of this river is environmentally and socially unacceptable?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1425	What evidence does the government have that the Churchill River ecosystem can sustain additional alteration without unacceptable impacts on fish populations, aquatic habitat, water quality, sediment movement, nutrients, river flows and downstream ecosystems?
1426	Why the rush for a deal for NL?
1427	Why does Newfoundland not have full control of its own resources? Oil? Power? Fish?
1428	Can we get equal electricity rates with Quebec as part of the agreement, for example if Quebec is 8 cents/kWh have an arrangement so all Newfoundland and Labrador pay a maximum of 8 cents per kWh?
1429	How come other countries pay very low fees for resources they produce but NL has some of the highest costs in the country?
1430	Why is the rate for selling power to Quebec fixed?
1431	What happened is 20 years if power rates increase x5 then we are fixed again?
1432	Moody's estimates roughly US$3 trillion will be invested in AI data centres globally between 2026 and How much of that is planned or committed in Newfoundland and Labrador, and does this agreement change that figure?
1433	Should there be a critical mineral discovery within an area that impacts the development of the hydro project, and NL decides the mineral asset development is in the best interest of NL, are there any negative impacts, or unintended consequences/liabilities for NL? There are many ways this could play out in the courts.
1434	Will the full text of the framework agreement (and any side letters, term sheets, or financial models) be released publicly before or during the special House of Assembly sitting, and will there be an independent review or audit of the $49 billion NPV valuation and risk allocation?
1435	Why don't we get paid for our electricity as "a percent of the current market rate" instead of fixed rates?
1436	Why can't the escalator clause be tied to both the cost of living and the market rate, not complicated could just have an either or statement depending on which is higher?
1437	I appreciated NL Hydro's explanation of the historical averages but In theory we could be in the same position we are now if the market rate skyrockets?
1438	Why isn't our future access to market direct why must we go through Hydro-Québec? The federal government has the power to force pipelines through other provinces why not electricity access.
1439	Why the big rush to sign? Please don't say jobs.
1440	Can you clearly and in depth provide an overview to the people of NL as to why this agreement is better than the liberal MOU of last year?
1441	Why are the people of NL not getting the opportunity to vote on this MoU as PROMISED?
1442	Why use a 50-year contract rather than a 20- or 25-year term?
1443	Why repeat the mistakes of the past with the lack of an escalation clause?
1444	Why are we only getting a small part of the profits while owning a much larger share?
1445	Why is a deal for a long-term?
1446	Why does Hydro-Québec get the power for much cheaper than the stakeholders (Newfoundlanders)?
1447	We are still paying $0.15/kWh while they pay half that?
1448	Why is the 15% reduction in rates coming from the Provincial purse and not Nalcor?
1449	Why do ratepayers in Labrador pay much less than ratepayers on the Island?
1450	Where is our referendum as promised by Wakeham?
1451	Why is the agreement not just about Churchill Falls and the set price of electricity?
1452	How is this deal different from the original deal?
1453	How does it benefit NL, not just for a few years with more jobs but long-term for generations to come?
1454	What are the differences between this deal and the one the Liberals were set to sign? Please provide a point-by-point breakdown.
1455	Why is the new deal 50 years just because Hydro-Québec will not accept terms beneficial to NL today?
1456	This new deal is still not a good deal for NL and will reduce the overall revenue to NL?
1457	Why do Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have to pay more for electricity than our Quebec Neighbors?
1458	Why is Gull Island part of this deal?
1459	The infrastructure already exists for Churchill Falls, but do the economics work for NL to build Gull Island?
1460	Considering that ALL major construction projects go over budget, as demonstrated by the horrifically managed Muskrat Falls Project. Why should the public have any faith in current estimates when no detailed engineering design has been completed?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1461	What studies have been completed to determine how much power NL will require for current and future industries?
1462	NL NEEDS more industries and manufacturing. What is the plan to attract new industries?
1463	Has there been any discussion about partnering with Asian or European automakers to build electric vehicles or battery plants in NL?
1464	Is there a plan to increase reliability of the Labrador Island Transmission cable and associated infrastructure?
1465	With this additional clean power, will the Holyrood thermal generating station be mothballed?
1466	Will there be a formal poll conducted to gauge public support for this deal if an official referendum will not be called?
1467	Why is this government so focused on short-term construction jobs?
1468	Will the agreement provide sufficient investment to maintain current and planned infrastructure throughout its operating life?
1469	Will Newfoundland and Labrador have a right of first refusal to purchase power at cost in proportion to its investment?
1470	Will Newfoundland and Labrador residents be exempt from taxes, bills or fees on power generated through their public investment?
1471	Will NL Power be relieved of obligations to provide income to shareholders, investors or board members?
1472	How will the board be reorganized to represent the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?
1473	Given the election promise that no Churchill Falls agreement would be signed before a referendum, why should the public trust the government after it reversed that commitment?
1474	If he backtracks on something as important as this, where does it end?
1475	Why doesn't the premier resign?
1476	Your overview on the government's website is difficult to read with too many technical indicators which the layman cannot understand. It seems to make no mention of the previous MOU's $2b a year for the province. Has this amount of money been renegotiated into something else and, if so, what is the benefit?
1477	Will this new agreement require any financial input from this province?
1478	Why does this have to a 50-year contract?
1479	Do you as the current government, sincerely believe that the upcoming HOA debate is comparable to what the Liberals permitted under their leadership?
1480	WHY is NL going top pay 4 or 5 times the amount for power than Quebec when it is our water/power/resource?
1481	WHY is government NL rushing this deal when "haste makes waste"?
1482	WHY will our government NOT stand up to Quebec and the federal government and say NO, this is not the best most fair deal possible?
1483	A provincial referendum was promised and residents of this province voted for government to negotiate a deal to be approved by the people, I ask where is the referendum?
1484	Why do Newfoundlanders and Labradorians have to pay more for power generated from their own provincial resources?
1485	What are the benefits in promising thousands of jobs in the construction/utility industry while the greatest portion of population are seniors, children and people employed in other industries?
1486	How was the proposed 15% discount calculated?
1487	Which province, NL or Quebec, will be principal beneficiary of the new agreement on Churchill Falls?
1488	Why are we entering into a new 50-year agreement when we are still suffering the consequences of the old agreement?
1489	Why was the promised referendum now being denied to the people of NL?
1490	Why is the Premier so fast to sign an agreement to the detriment of NL?
1491	It's a reminder of when Ottawa gave away the fishing rights to foreign governments and the cod fishery collapsed. If we own the resources, why are we not the beneficiaries of this resource?
1492	Why isn't the premier standing up to Quebec and Ottawa?
1493	Why is it political parties never keep their promises and put the residents of NL first?
1494	Why do we still pay less for electricity than Quebec?
1495	Has anyone in gov actually read the very articulate, informed posts by [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]'s?
1496	What is the hurry with trying to sign an MOU that still has so many questions?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1497	What happened to the promise of a referendum on the agreement?
1498	Will NL's electricity rates be lowered to match that of Quebec?
1499	Can a shorter term (i.e., 25-year) agreement be made, with scheduled reviews, instead of locking into long-term 50-year agreement?
1500	What are the long-term risks?
1501	Does Quebec maintain greater control and disproportionate benefits from the Upper and Lower Churchill agreements?
1502	Why is the legislative debate limited to such a short window and have such a short question period?
1503	Is the wind energy component just a pipe dream? We saw recent proposed wind developments fold.
1504	Why is the current rate received by NL remain so low for so long? __ It remains WELL below market. There is no logic for this and from an NPV perspective this lost revenue can never be replaced. The rate must be some reasonable percentage of the market (i.e., received) rate; This is not a function of any capital paid by QC (as that is a requirement to gain equity in new projects/capacity).
1505	Why is the focus on NL jobs (that can never be filled based on population / demographic data) versus revenue and economics? Why not be transparent on the expected employment impact versus quoting a clearly unachievable goal?
1506	Why is there always a rush component to making a multi-generational deal?
1507	This is what Joey did. My question. how did that turn out?
1508	Does NL get to sell direct or not - wheeling arrangement?
1509	Can NL negotiate power supply contracts with directly clients outside of NL (Canada / US; Government. / Industry)? Is transmission capacity through QC guaranteed or do we just get extorted again with that infrastructure?
1510	There are no undeveloped "economic" iron mines in Labrador; They can't sell all the ore now. Why the pandering to the unfinanceable Junior mining co's?
1511	Why does the proposed agreement have a 50-year term?
1512	If we must have a 50-year contract could we include clauses where the rate per kw we receive from Quebec will be renegotiated every ten years?
1513	NL residents hydro bills are increasing every year. the proposed annual 15% rebate on first 2000 kWh does not address this issue. In the new agreement Why is the KW rate Nfld residents is expected to pay so much higher than Quebec residents?
1514	Could we negotiate NL be paid the same rate as Quebec residents during the life of the agreement?
1515	Why are we not receiving the same rate as Quebec for power?
1516	With the new Churchill Falls agreement, does the government have any of the new proceeds specifically earmarked to help struggling seniors who are on fixed incomes?
1517	Why can't power be shipped through the link to Nova Scotia rather than through Quebec?
1518	I would like to see the new MOU but the last one included the upgrade of the existing Churchill Falls turbines. Why was that not part of the current contract with Quebec hydro and managed by CFLCO?
1519	My biggest question, why is Newfoundland and Labrador giving up a percentage of ownership? How was the percentage rate calculated?
1520	How will government ensure that housing, health care, education, mental health and addictions services, law enforcement, social services and road infrastructure can support the development and associated population growth?
1521	The resources of Newfoundland and Labrador belong to the present and future citizens of our province. Our elected representatives, no matter their political stripes, should honor our people by obtaining the best long-term "deal" possible. If there is any hint that we are leaving profits on the table, we should postpone the signing of any new agreement at this time. Is it possible that there are any extra funds for NL that may NOT be clearly visible within the existing paperwork?
1522	What has been discussed "under the table" with the feds for our premier and party and politicians on the negotiation team?
1523	Do we foresee appointments to the Senate for any of these individuals?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1524	With the Churchill Falls MOU, why did Government agree to a set price model without any escalation clause, and a 50-year deal? These were the two main issues with the 1969 deal and we are set to make the same mistake again.
1525	Why is the new agreement so long?
1526	It should not be longer than 25 years. Why is the 15% HST rebate on NL Power tied to the Churchill Falls deal?
1527	Why are Newfoundlanders and Labradorians paying higher electricity rates than Quebec taxpayers?
1528	As market prices for energy rise globally, external jurisdictions will be willing to pay a premium for our power. What economic guardrails or domestic reservation clauses are built into the 2026 framework to ensure that local green industrial projects or home grown businesses in NL are guaranteed access to affordable blocks of Churchill Falls power, rather than having local development stifled by the financial temptation to export everything to high priced US and Quebec markets?
1529	Why is the agreement being rushed without enough time to assess whether it is the best deal, given concerns that it feels like 1969 again?
1530	The PC Government was criticized for not sending the MF deal to the PUB for review before going ahead, and it ended up in a Judicial Inquiry, with all kinds of accusations and a doubled project cost. The Liberal Government was criticized for not referring the 2024 MOU to the PUB. Indeed when the PC's were elected they immediately referred the 2024 to an IRC of the PC's choosing. Why hasn't Tony Wakeham referred the MOU 2 to an IRC for "independent" review, or preferably to our PUB for their review?
1531	Why is the MOU 50 years from 2041, 25 years is the recommended maximum?
1532	Why are we not getting the same if not better consumer power rates as the consumers in Quebec, they pay less than half of what we pay, and we own the power?
1533	Why do we not have an energy corridor through Quebec to sell our electricity at market rates to whoever we want?
1534	Why is our excess to additional power from Churchill Falls and Gull Island capped at 500 megawatts, a growth rate for NL of only 1% per year for 33 years?
1535	Why sign another 50-year agreement rather than use a 10-year term with renegotiation?
1536	What are the alternatives?
1537	If we let the current agreement run out, what do we stand to lose or gain?
1538	Why are we as taxpayers expected to fund the majority of the upgrades to the existing Churchill Falls plant, while once complete our province only avails of an additional 7% of the power while CFLCo owns 65%?
1539	Do you agree that this is not in the people of this provinces best interest?
1540	We at a minimum should receive 65 percent of the value of all future power that is produced at the Churchill Falls plant. Why are we potentially (if HQ decides to proceed, we have no say) funding the majority (60%) of GI project and then in turn HQ provides 40 percent of the cost but avails of 86% of the power?
1541	Did you ever intend to follow through on any of your campaign promises regarding this agreement?
1542	Why did you bother to open the negotiation back up if you were willing to accept very marginal gains?
1543	What is the shortest duration of contract that was seriously proposed?
1544	Did you ever seriously consider a path to recouping both the Muskrat Falls shortfall and the electricity price differential between Newfoundland and Quebec as part of this agreement?
1545	Are you listening to any of the commenters who have provided extensive feedback on this MOU, particularly [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]'s and the group of experts and commenters providing articles for the Uncle Gnarly blog?
1546	Was there any consideration given to the idea of simply walking away from the table entirely with the understanding that 15 - or even 5 - years from now we are in a much better position to negotiate a new Churchill Falls agreement?
1547	I am a mom of two teens. My husband and I both put ourselves through university. Both of us work thankfully. Will this deal alleviate the financial strain on everyday Newfoundlanders and Labradorians who are working and raising and educating good community citizens?
1548	Middle class is not what it was. We need to see some relief. Will this relief, if it comes, be material? We need to address the real cost of living.
1549	How is this better than previous Liberal MOU?
1550	Was the escalating clause removed and if so why?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1551	Why are we paying more for electricity than Quebec, they pay 6.1 to 6.9% and we pay 16.7%?
1552	How is this a fair deal for Newfoundlanders?
1553	When you were running for election you stated there is no rush on signing this deal, you were going to take your time and Newfoundlanders would have the better deal, why now is there a rush to have this deal signed and passed?
1554	Why is the 15% rebate being tied to the MOU when it is actually coming from Newfoundland purse?
1555	Will government publish a clear, plain-language breakdown of the agreement from a single authoritative source?
1556	What is the source and duration of the 15% electricity rebate, and how will it be adjusted as market conditions and electricity rates change?
1557	Will government consider freezing electricity rates so future increases do not offset the value of the rebate?
1558	Will government hold a referendum before committing the Province to the agreement?
1559	One of the key lessons from the original 1969 Churchill Falls agreement is the difficulty of predicting electricity market conditions decades into the future. The agreement was negotiated based on the market assumptions and economic realities of the time, yet subsequent changes in electricity prices significantly altered the value of the power produced, leading many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to believe the province did not fully benefit from those changing market conditions. Given this history, how does the current Memorandum of Understanding address the risk that future electricity market prices could differ substantially from today's expectations?
1560	What analysis has been completed using a range of future price scenarios, and what mechanisms within the MOU ensure that Newfoundland and Labrador receives a fair share of the value created if market prices are significantly higher or lower than forecast over the life of the agreement?
1561	More specifically, what safeguards have been built into the MOU to prevent future generations from finding themselves in a situation where changing market conditions create an imbalance in benefits similar to the concerns that emerged from the original Churchill Falls agreement?
1562	Can Newfoundland negotiate a price directly with other markets willing to buy our power?
1563	Why are Quebec residents paying half of the rate we do in Newfoundland to heat our homes?
1564	Why is the term of the new MOU agreement set at 50 years?
1565	Wouldn't a term of 15 years would provide more protection for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in unreliable markets?
1566	What rights and control does Quebec receive over Gull Island and Churchill River Power and what happens when the agreements expire?
1567	How much will Gull Island cost NL and who pays if construction goes billions over budget?
1568	What will NL actually own?
1569	What is the guaranteed price for Gull Island power (the underlying power price calculated in the reported $49 billion)?
1570	Can Quebec compete with NL on selling power to other markets?
1571	What would it cost NL to build their own transmission route to another market, and how does it compare with the value given up by using QC system?
1572	What specific projects are being planned to use that electricity in NL?
1573	What is worst case scenario cost to NL if projected revenue is much lower?
1574	What happens to electricity rates for Newfoundlanders after Gull Island construction costs are included?
1575	Are there requirements for Newfoundland owned engineering, trucking, construction and supply companies?
1576	Will the complete deal be published publicly before Newfoundlanders are expected to accept it?
1577	Does a comparison exist if NL developed Gull Island, partnered differently, retained more power, exported more directly or waited for electricity prices to rise comparing to the current deal?
1578	Is it possible for NL to develop Gull Island on their own?
1579	The new agreement for Churchill Falls is supposed to benefit all Newfoundland and LABRADOR but there is nothing for the north coast of Labrador. The hydro electric power can be sold and transmitted to customers in Quebec, the island of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia but not the north coast of Labrador. Why is there no mention of a transmission line to the north coast of Labrador?
1580	The north coast of Labrador is still part of the province but we are excluded from most benefits. Why hasn't the Nunatsiavut Government or Innu Nation been consulted on a transmission line to the north coast of Labrador?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1581	If there is no intention of a transmission line to the north coast of Labrador or no evidence of consultation with the Nunatsiavut Government or the Innu Nation can the electricity rates of the north coast of Labrador be subsidized to match the lower rates in Goose Bay?
1582	The 1967 deal was signed assuming NL would reap benefits. Muskrat Falls was signed assuming there would be good benefits. Both deals were signed in good faith. Tell me why and how this deal avoids future pitfalls?
1583	Once a deal is signed how long before benefits flow to NL?
1584	Why has current Government decided not to have a referendum?
1585	Can the government demonstrate that its negotiators are better equipped and that this deal is substantially better?
1586	Now Premier Wakeham adamantly promised a public referendum if elected and that has vanished in a rush to sign another locked in 50-year agreement, weighted in Quebec's favour, same as the previous government. Why the broken promise, unnecessary rush to sign a locked in 50-year agreement that experienced private financial people are against?
1587	Are we that desperate, financially stricken and politically motivated to repeat if not the past, something only slightly better?
1588	What process will there be for NL to revisit the terms of the agreement, a second multi generational deal, and avoid having the experience of the current deal repeating until 2076?
1589	Under the old MOU the government of newfoundland was to receive one billion dollars from Quebec upon signing and another one billion dollars at the end of the first 12 months. Considering the provinces current financial position and need for cash, what is the immediate cash inflow the province will receive upon signing and in the first 12 months?
1590	In this agreement, we lose optionality: on duration, on price, and on power usage. Why are we ceding so much control to Quebec?
1591	Why are we locking for 50 years, especially when global standards for hydro deals are much lower? Specifically, why are we locking in for 50 years with Churchill Falls, an asset that has been paid for and is owned by NL?
1592	Why are we locked into supplying 75% of power to Quebec, and have we investigated other options and users of this power?
1593	The issue is not about selling to Quebec, it is why are we locked in?
1594	The DCIA and the MOU are almost identical. The IRC determined that the MOU was not in the interest of the province. Will the government send the DCIA to the IRC for review?
1595	Why are we rushing so hard to get a deal?
1596	Why is Hydro-Québec writing the contracts for our resources?
1597	What independent studies have been done to confirm that this is the best deal for the province?
1598	Why have we bundled all these developments together in one, rather than separate deals? A high-risk venture like Gull Island shouldn't be grouped in the same category with the same terms as a low risk, paid for asset like Churchill Falls.
1599	Why is the DCIA so complicated when it could be much simpler?
1600	Are promised jobs guaranteed or tied to optional projects like Gull, decided by Quebec?
1601	Why is pricing not tied to market rates?
1602	Why is pricing fixed and not available for review and updating at 5-year intervals?
1603	This project does not ensure NL receives primary benefit for its resources. Why continue if that is the case?
1604	Does the premier truly understand what his legacy will be if he signs this deal?
1605	As per this MOU, Will the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador still owe money on this project after the 50-year contract is fulfilled?
1606	If a 50-year commitment is considered too long and risky for an individual, why should it be considered acceptable when the people making the decision are committing the resources and future of an entire province?
1607	We have made this mistake in the past and are repeating history. The Canadian Federal Government is prepared to put billions of dollars behind Gull Island, why should Newfoundland and Labrador need to surrender long-term control of the project to Québec in order to build it? And why would we sign a contract giving up Churchill Falls for another 50 years along with this new development?
1608	How can Quebec get better rates than us in this agreement?
1609	Why is the government rushing to sign this agreement?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1610	The different projects need to be unbundled and the business case for each explained to the people of the province. Will the government take the time to do this?
1611	Why does this deal have to be signed for 50 years?
1612	Is there not a smaller timeframe that this can be based upon?
1613	What would you say is the most beneficial part of this MOU?
1614	Regarding the everyday resident of Newfoundland, how will you ensure that we will be the major beneficiaries for 50 years?
1615	What are the different factors used to form the discount rate of 5.822%?
1616	In particular, what is the percentage of inflation included in this rate?
1617	What is the risk factor percentage included in this rate?
1618	Is there a maturity premium included in the discount rate?
1619	Are there other factors that were considered in finalizing the 5.822% discount rate?
1620	What is the projected capital cost of the 1275 MW capacity upgrade at the existing Churchill Falls plant?
1621	Before binding Newfoundland and Labrador to this 50-year arrangement, will the Province disclose an independent comparison of the total economic value this deal delivers to NL versus the value Hydro-Québec receives, including resale and avoided-cost benefits, and explain why NL should commit now rather than wait until 2041-especially without a mandatory periodic market-price reset to ensure Newfoundlanders capture their fair share if the future value of Labrador hydro rises dramatically?
1622	Will the revenue collected contain a legacy fund for future generations and enhanced prosperity?
1623	Will this project allow government to tackle the debt in a meaningful way?
1624	What major benefits will Newfoundland get from this deal?
1625	The announcement gave some significant dollar numbers in revenue for the province, but this amount was based on an increase of capacity at the power stations along the Churchill River (including at Gull Island), as well as wind generation. How likely is it that these capacity increase proposals will actually occur?
1626	The world is different than it was 15 years ago, will there be a new public consultation to canvass the people of Labrador on their opinions and concerns with the new MOU proposals? This would include full and proper consult with Indigenous leaders.
1627	Why are we rushing this deal through when we are not the primary or even equal beneficiary?
1628	Why do you believe this is the best deal and why can't a better deal for be reached if we waited?
1629	Why can't we charge Quebec more for their rate which is around 5 cents when everyone else has to pay so much more?
1630	Can you separate and breakdown the agreement for the pubic?
1631	Knowing the controversy regarding wind farms on the west coast of NL, can we guarantee aboriginals will allow a wind farm in Labrador?
1632	How is this MOU better, without the input of the federal government?
1633	My understanding is that we will have in excess of 350 MW of power from hydro and 400 MW of power from the proposed wind farm in Labrador. If we have more power, will Quebec Hydro allow us to transmit more power over its transmission lines at a negotiated price or will they tell us what price we get?
1634	Will Danny Williams come out and on the record say this is a good deal?
1635	Will the PC government commit to the promise they made during the election and hold a referendum?
1636	Given the historic significance and extraordinarily long-term implications of this agreement, how will Newfoundlanders and Labradorians be able to independently verify that the final agreement is truly in the best long-term interest of the province, rather than relying primarily on Government's interpretation of the agreement?
1637	Will the Government therefore commit to having the complete final and binding agreements independently reviewed by a non-partisan panel of experts with appropriate expertise in energy markets, economics, finance, engineering and contract law before Newfoundland and Labrador becomes irrevocably committed?
1638	Will that review specifically stress-test the agreement against a range of long-term scenarios, including significantly higher or lower electricity prices, inflation, changes in interest rates, construction cost overruns, technological disruption, changing energy demand, new transmission opportunities and changes in North American electricity markets?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1639	Will Government commit to publishing the independent panel's complete report, including its methodology, assumptions, risks, concerns, conclusions and recommendations, subject only to genuinely necessary legal or commercial redactions, rather than publishing only a summary or selected findings?
1640	What enforceable mechanisms have been included to prevent future generations from again finding themselves locked into an agreement that made sense when signed but no longer reflects the true value of the resource?
1641	Creating permanent intergenerational wealth from Churchill Falls Given the significant long-term revenues expected to flow to Newfoundland and Labrador from this agreement, is the Province considering establishing a permanent, independently governed sovereign wealth or legacy fund, similar in principle to Norway's Government Pension Fund Global?
1642	Rather than allowing all new revenues generated through Churchill Falls and Gull Island to become part of annual government spending, would Government consider dedicating a defined portion of these revenues to a fund that is invested for the long-term and intended to create permanent wealth for future generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians?
1643	If such a fund is considered, would Government also consider legislated rules governing contributions, investment, withdrawals and governance so that future governments cannot simply draw down the fund to address short-term fiscal or political pressures?
1644	How will the Province ensure that our children and grandchildren inherit not simply memories of a major agreement, but tangible and lasting financial wealth from it?
1645	What assumptions produce the stated $49-billion value?
1646	Government has stated that the new agreement represents approximately $49 billion in financial benefit to Newfoundland and Labrador on a 2026 net-present-value basis. What discount rate, electricity-price forecasts, inflation assumptions, interest-rate assumptions, construction-cost estimates, operating-cost assumptions, exchange-rate assumptions and other material inputs were used to arrive at the $49-billion figure?
1647	Will those assumptions and the underlying financial model be made public, to the greatest extent commercially possible?
1648	Will government also publish sensitivity analyses showing what the agreement is worth under substantially different scenarios rather than presenting residents with only the expected or preferred scenario?
1649	What is the NPV under pessimistic, base-case and optimistic assumptions?
1650	What happens if electricity becomes much more valuable than anyone expects today?
1651	What provisions ensure that Newfoundland and Labrador participates appropriately in increases in the future market value of Churchill River electricity?
1652	Does the agreement contain mandatory periodic market-price resets, indexing mechanisms, revenue-sharing provisions or reopening clauses?
1653	If market conditions change dramatically 10, 20 or 30 years from now, can Newfoundland and Labrador require pricing or other commercial terms to be reconsidered without requiring Hydro-Québec's consent? If not, why is Government confident that the pricing structure negotiated today will remain appropriate over such a long period?
1654	What happens when Newfoundland and Labrador and Quebec disagree?
1655	What dispute-resolution mechanisms apply if Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and Hydro-Québec fundamentally disagree over pricing, transmission access, power allocation, scheduling, construction, interpretation of contractual provisions or another material issue?
1656	Is dispute resolution truly independent?
1657	Can either party delay or frustrate Newfoundland and Labrador's ability to exercise its contractual rights through prolonged litigation, arbitration or withholding of cooperation?
1658	Are there specific timelines and remedies built into the agreement to prevent this?
1659	Who carries the downside risk if these projects cost substantially more than expected?
1660	If construction costs increase significantly, projects are delayed, interest rates rise, financing becomes more expensive, environmental approvals impose additional costs, or unforeseen engineering problems emerge, who bears those costs?
1661	What is the maximum financial exposure of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro and the Province?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1662	Could cost overruns, additional borrowing or project delays reduce the $49-billion benefit currently being presented to residents? Government should provide not only its expected financial case, but a credible downside scenario showing what taxpayers and ratepayers could ultimately be exposed to if major assumptions prove wrong.
1663	How much debt and contingent liability will Newfoundland and Labrador ultimately assume?
1664	What additional debt, loan guarantees, contractual commitments or contingent liabilities will appear directly or indirectly on the balance sheets of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, Churchill Falls (Labrador) Corporation or the Province as a result of these developments?
1665	What is the anticipated debt at peak construction?
1666	What is the maximum potential exposure under a reasonable downside scenario?
1667	Will the Province publish a consolidated analysis showing both the expected economic benefits and the associated liabilities so residents can evaluate the net benefit rather than the benefits in isolation?
1668	Are we maximizing the economic value of our electricity, rather than simply its sale price?
1669	Has Government completed a comprehensive long-term analysis comparing the economic value of exporting electricity with using that same electricity to attract mining, mineral processing, manufacturing, data centres, technology, hydrogen production or other energy-intensive industries to Newfoundland and Labrador?
1670	A megawatt sold outside the province generates electricity revenue. A megawatt used within the province could potentially generate employment, corporate taxation, personal income tax, municipal tax revenue, population growth and secondary economic activity. How will these competing values be assessed?
1671	Will future governments retain sufficient flexibility to redirect electricity toward higher-value domestic opportunities if they emerge?
1672	What rights does Newfoundland and Labrador have to transmission outside Quebec?
1673	Government has announced significant new transmission rights through Quebec and access to markets in Ontario and the northeastern United States. Are these rights guaranteed for the entire term of the agreement?
1674	Who controls scheduling and priority of that transmission capacity?
1675	What happens if transmission becomes constrained?
1676	Can Hydro-Québec or another party restrict Newfoundland and Labrador's access under particular circumstances?
1677	Does Newfoundland and Labrador receive the actual market price obtained for its exported electricity, and will it have sufficient information to independently verify the price obtained in those markets?
1678	Could Newfoundland and Labrador eventually use these transmission rights to sell electricity directly to customers or markets independently of Hydro-Québec?
1679	What happens if North America's energy system changes dramatically?
1680	A contract extending decades into the future must contemplate technologies and markets that may not exist today. How has the agreement been designed to account for major changes such as large-scale battery storage, small modular nuclear reactors, hydrogen, offshore wind, artificial intelligence-driven electricity demand, new transmission corridors or technologies that fundamentally change how electricity is generated, stored, transmitted or priced?
1681	Does Newfoundland and Labrador retain the flexibility to take advantage of opportunities that cannot reasonably be anticipated in 2026?
1682	What happens at the end of the agreement?
1683	At the expiry of these arrangements, who owns the generating stations, transmission infrastructure and other assets associated with Churchill Falls, Gull Island and related developments?
1684	What rights remain with Hydro-Québec?
1685	What rights revert fully and unconditionally to Newfoundland and Labrador?
1686	Are there renewal rights, rights of first refusal, extension provisions, purchase options or other contractual clauses that could constrain the Province's options at that time?
1687	What does Newfoundland and Labrador's position look like on the day after the agreement expires?
1688	What prevents future governments from changing the deal or trading away important rights?
1689	To what extent can a future provincial government amend these agreements, sell interests in the projects, pledge revenues, alter Newfoundland and Labrador's allocation of power or otherwise change the protections being negotiated today?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1690	Are any fundamental provincial rights protected by legislation, supermajority requirements or other mechanisms? If this agreement is intended to protect Newfoundland and Labrador for generations, residents should understand which protections are contractual promises and which are effectively irreversible safeguards.
1691	What does success actually look like for Newfoundland and Labrador?
1692	Government has understandably emphasized the overall dollar value of the agreement. However, what measurable outcomes will be used to determine whether the agreement is actually delivering what was promised?
1693	Will Government establish and publicly report against long-term measures such as: Revenues received versus forecast; Actual electricity prices versus assumptions; Debt and financing costs; Construction costs and overruns; Newfoundland and Labrador's electricity retained for domestic use; Export volumes and prices; Employment created; Industrial development enabled; Indigenous participation and benefits; Economic development in Labrador; Provincial debt reduction; and Amounts, if any, invested for future generations?
1694	Will these results be reported publicly and independently over the life of the agreement so future governments can be held accountable against the assumptions being presented today?
1695	What would make government walk away?
1696	Any credible negotiation should have a point at which the risks outweigh the benefits. What are Newfoundland and Labrador's non-negotiable conditions for the final agreements?
1697	What financial, legal, construction or market developments would cause Government to conclude that the agreement should not proceed? And before the final agreements become binding, will residents and Members of the House of Assembly be given enough information to independently assess whether those conditions have actually been met? Newfoundlanders and Labradorians know better than most that the true quality of a long-term resource agreement cannot be judged by the headlines on the day it is signed. It will be judged by the opportunities, protections and wealth it provides decades from now. This is a rare opportunity to get these questions right before the Province is committed for generations.
1698	Why is the Government allowing an escalator clause based on the annual cost of living index?
1699	Why wouldn't the Government commit to the Annual Cost of Power, Contract Costs as the escalator?
1700	Why won't the Government allow for a referendum vote, the one that was promised and the ONLY REASON, why I voted for the current Government into power?
1701	Why is the Federal Government not giving financial guarantee that equal to Quebec's?
1702	How is giving up 40% of Churchill Falls helpful to Newfoundlanders in the future?
1703	Why isn't power rates going down?
1704	What is the repayment term in years and the interest rate related to the capital cost of the 1275 Megawatt upgrade portion of the existing Churchill Falls plant?
1705	Before entering a long-term agreement, understand not only what the deal provides today, but also how changes in prices, markets, bargaining power, technology, and circumstances could affect both parties tomorrow. Were the parties involved in the agreement never thinking in terms of time series, future generating compound and multiplier effects?
1706	Why do you have it at 50 years after 2041? That's 65 years from now.
1707	Why are we Newfoundlanders paying ~15 cents per kWh and Quebec is only paying a fraction of that?
1708	What independent analysis can the government provide to demonstrate that the pricing and escalation formulas in this agreement will ensure Newfoundland and Labrador receives fair market value for its power over the entire life of the deal-and what protections allow future generations to reopen or renegotiate those terms if electricity market values significantly outpace the agreed pricing?
1709	Why has Tony Wakeman thrown away his chance to become a great leader by choosing to pursue a deal in which Newfoundland and Labrador are not the primary beneficiaries?
1710	Why has Tony Wakeman thrown away his chance of being a great leader by choosing to block the referendum and undermine the democratic right of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador to decide?
1711	Why are both political parties so invested in giving away the long-term benefits of Newfoundland and Labrador's last great resource for another short-term fix?
1712	Why is Newfoundland and Labrador effectively subsidizing Quebec's power rates while Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are paying full market value?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1713	What independent economic analysis has the government used to demonstrate that this deal provides the best possible return for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador?
1714	What alternatives were considered, and why were they rejected?
1715	If this deal is truly beneficial for Newfoundland and Labrador, why not allow the people to vote on it through a referendum?
1716	What specific protections are included to prevent future governments or external parties from benefiting at the expense of Newfoundland and Labrador ratepayers?
1717	What is the estimated value of the benefits that Quebec will receive under the same agreement over those same periods?
1718	How does the government justify locking future generations into a long-term agreement that they had no opportunity to influence?
1719	How badly does NL need the cash infusion from a new deal with HQ now?
1720	Putting politics and party affiliation aside, if we look at this agreement through the lens of the next 50 or 100 years, can those involved say with confidence that future generations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will view this as a fair and responsible agreement?
1721	The original Churchill Falls agreement taught us the consequences of making very long-term decisions that do not adequately account for how circumstances, markets and the value of our resources can change over time. What protections and flexibility are built into this agreement to ensure we have not once again committed future generations to terms they may deeply regret? Specifically, is there anything Newfoundland and Labrador is giving up today, whether in access to power, ownership, pricing, transmission, future development opportunities or control of our resources, that we could reasonably protect or negotiate differently before the agreement is finalized?
1722	How can we be confident that this agreement is fair to all parties while ensuring Newfoundland and Labrador receives the full and lasting value of its own resources?
1723	What analysis has been completed to determine how much electricity Newfoundland and Labrador may require 25, 50 or more years from now for mining, industry, electrification, emerging technologies and other development that cannot currently be predicted?
1724	If our future demand is significantly greater than today's forecasts, what mechanisms allow Newfoundland and Labrador to reclaim, redirect or purchase additional power without paying substantially more for electricity generated from its own resources?
1725	How does the agreement protect Newfoundland and Labrador if the market value of clean, reliable hydroelectricity increases far beyond today's projections?
1726	Are there regular pricing resets, market value adjustments, reopening provisions or other mechanisms that ensure Newfoundland and Labrador continues to receive a fair share of the value of the electricity throughout the life of the agreement, rather than locking future generations into assumptions being made in 2026?
1727	Is the 985 MW of transmission access a guaranteed legal right for the full life of the agreement, and under what circumstances could that access be reduced, constrained or become economically unattractive?
1728	Who controls decisions about when and where Newfoundland and Labrador's power is sold, and are there any circumstances in which Hydro-Québec could directly or indirectly limit Newfoundland and Labrador's ability to obtain the best available market price?
1729	If Gull Island experiences significant construction delays or cost overruns, who ultimately bears those costs?
1730	What is the maximum financial exposure of Newfoundland and Labrador, NL Hydro and provincial ratepayers, and is there any circumstance under the agreement in which Newfoundland and Labrador could become responsible for substantially more debt or financial risk than currently projected?
1731	The Independent Churchill River Review Committee specifically raised concerns about governance arrangements where Hydro-Québec could simultaneously be a shareholder, customer and participant in decision-making. How has that potential conflict been resolved in the new agreement?
1732	On what significant decisions will Newfoundland and Labrador have sole authority, on what decisions will Quebec have a say, and are there any circumstances in which Quebec could prevent Newfoundland and Labrador from acting in what it believes to be its own best economic interest?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1733	The agreement is being presented as providing Newfoundland and Labrador with $49 billion in net present value. What assumptions produce that figure, including electricity prices, discount rates, inflation, construction costs and future demand?
1734	Has that valuation been independently stress tested using less favourable assumptions, and will those analyses be made public before the agreement receives final approval?
1735	The Quebec versus Newfoundland and Labrador power allocation It has been stated publicly that Quebec will receive approximately 3,500 MW of additional power while Newfoundland and Labrador receives approximately 750 MW more than under the previous proposal. Rather than simply comparing those numbers, can government demonstrate the economic value received by each province from the complete agreement?
1736	In particular, what percentage of the total long-term economic value created by the Churchill River developments ultimately accrues to Newfoundland and Labrador, Quebec and other parties respectively, including the value of the electricity itself, ownership returns, transmission rights and other benefits?
1737	Ability to correct an unforeseen problem Perhaps most importantly, what happens if we are wrong?
1738	If circumstances change dramatically over the next several decades, or if a provision of this agreement produces an outcome that neither party anticipated in 2026, what reopening, review or renegotiation mechanisms exist?
1739	Does the agreement contain scheduled comprehensive reviews that allow future governments to correct an inequity without having to obtain the consent of a party that benefits from that inequity?
1740	Does Hydro-Québec have complete control over the selling price of the power exported to the US markets?
1741	Will the inflation be considered in the selling price every 5 years or so?
1742	Can either NL or Quebec scrap the deal once it is signed?
1743	What happens if Quebec leaves confederation during the life of the contract?
1744	Can the latest MOU be run through a financial feasibility study quickly through third party?
1745	Why 50-year agreement and not suggest a short-term 25-year agreement for example?
1746	Why the urgency when all along this government touted patience (and we heard latest explanation, but this appears to be externally pressured)?
1747	Why our electrical rate is still 16 cents/kw after obtaining these kinds of revenues?
1748	Do not care for the political motivations please determine whether current MOU is a fair deal or not and if so make real significant impact on lowering cost of living for Newfoundlanders?
1749	Where waterpower was used for generating electricity, little or no water royalties were collected by provincial governments. Do the government plan to collect water royalties?
1750	Do the provincial government plan to change their policy regimes to allow electricity prices to be brought into line with marginal cost by allowing competition in its electricity markets?
1751	The independent review says the MOU, as currently configured, is not in the long-term best interest of Newfoundland and Labrador. What specific provisions would you insist be changed before you would support a final agreement-and will you publicly commit to voting against it if those changes aren't made?
1752	Why should Newfoundland and Labrador give up negotiating leverage by agreeing to long-term power arrangements before we have a clear, independently verified plan for how much of Churchill Falls and Gull Island power will actually be available for economic development inside our province?
1753	If the government believes this deal is better than walking away, will you support publishing the full economic model-including prices, payment obligations, debt, export limitations, and the province's projected return over the entire life of the agreement-so the public can independently compare the MOU with the alternatives?
1754	Most agree that Newfoundland should be the primary beneficiary of the hydro resource. Why is the price that Hydro-Québec is paying so low?
1755	It seems that they are the primary beneficiary of the resource given that are getting low priced energy for 50 Years. Why does the price start so low and remain there for many years?
1756	It seems like a bargain for them. Why is there not a sub sea cable part of this deal to supply cheap power to island users of our province?
1757	I worry that the benchmark we are using to determine if we are getting a good deal is based on comparison to the old deal which was a historic injustice to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. What benchmarks or comparisons have been used to determine what is a good deal?
1758	Has there been jurisdictional research to see how landlocked regions deal with transmission agreements?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1759	I understand Quebec is still getting wholesale prices compared to market, however that energy (the bulk being produced) can then just be flipped and sold on the market to the United States. Why is there not a more balanced sharing of profit from any energy sold to other countries, while still respecting wholesale pricing for Quebec's domestic uses?
1760	It is apparent that the Provincial Government has made up its mind on the Churchill Falls agreement even with the concerns addressed by our provinces brightest and most experienced intellectuals and every day tax paying citizens who deserve to be heard. So, I ask the government, what words do you need or want to hear from an individual, or group of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians that would slow down, pause, or cancel this MOU 2 agreement in its current form?
1761	Why will we end up with an electrical rate double of that of Quebec residents?
1762	Why not wait until the current deal with Quebec expires, then renegotiate the new rates that would be more favourable to Newfoundland and Labrador?
1763	Why not a 25-year deal, rather than a 50-year deal?
1764	Why is there no clause that allows a revaluation of the terms every 5 or 10 years?
1765	What is the immediate gain to NL?
1766	Will I see cheaper power bills in the long-term and for the duration of the deal?
1767	Why share with a resource that is entirely in NL?
1768	What, in plain language, are the key differences between the agreement that was announced last year and the agreement that was announced this year?
1769	What was the reason for the changes?
1770	How did we get a better deal this time as opposed to last time?
1771	What is our return on electricity once the agreement is signed?
1772	Is there a cost of living clause in the new agreement for power purchased from Upper Churchill and Gull Island?
1773	Is there a review/reopener clause, say ever 5 years to determine if benefits are fair?
1774	Does the cost to purchase Upper Churchill and Gull Island power escalate with the cost of living?
1775	Why such a long contract?
1776	What percentage of Churchill Falls and Gull Island does Newfoundland and Labrador own after the agreement?
1777	What is the pro-rated value of the agreement at the end?
1778	Can you give a yearly projection of our revenue once the agreement is signed?
1779	Will our electricity rates go down above the 15 percent recently announced?
1780	What impact will this agreement have on the Rate Mitigation agreement under Muskrat Falls?
1781	Premier Wakeham: If you feel the agreement is too complex for us to understand, then a referendum should never have been an election promise. Given that, why not allow people like [IDENTIFIER REDACTED], [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]'s or [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] or many other "intelligent" Newfoundlanders to speak on our behalf, ask questions and participate in the discussion?
1782	Why are you rushing the process?
1783	Why are we agreeing to such a long-term deal?
1784	Is there an opportunity to renegotiate the rate per kWh payable to NL if market rates increase more than currently anticipated?
1785	Analysts of MOU2 have concluded that most Churchill Falls energy continues to be sold to Hydro-Québec at a price starting below 2 cents per kWh in 2027, reaching 10.85 cents by 2041 and only approaching today's replacement cost of 17 cents around 2054. This succinctly captures my concern. Is it true that MOU2 will not deliver enough revenue to offset the current Muskrat Falls subsidy?
1786	Why are we not getting our voices heard in a referendum promised by our now Premier?
1787	Can the following be used as a blueprint for discussions and for moving forward? On the $49B, the Government should break this down which is essentially a question I sent in to EngageNL: Existing Churchill Falls separately. Gull Island separately. Upgrades separately. Transmission separately. Federal support separately. Then show NL's and HQ's economics for each. Don't throw away the $49B package, federal participation, Gull Island opportunity and relationship with Quebec-but don't sign away NL's future either. Unbundle the economics, improve the return, secure genuine market access, retain enough power, protect NL control and investigate what we could build with the electricity ourselves.
1788	What guarantees does NL have that the province's rates will increase, over time, during the life of the project?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1789	I have heard that there is no "interruption formula" or increase unless there are special circumstances. The ability for NL to sell power through Quebec's power lines is tied to an agreed price with no ability for NL to negotiate their own rate. How can we ensure that NL is getting the best return possible if Quebec owns the negotiation of price?
1790	I do not believe that a referendum is needed to move this project forward but I do believe that this project deserves full scrutiny from the House of Assembly. When can we expect a FULL debate on the project and not just the planned information session?
1791	Why was Gull Island left out of the agreement?
1792	Are there plans to construct power generation there and what will that project do to conditions of this project?
1793	If an energy corridor was established by the federal government for the TMX, why was this not an option for NL to get its power to other markets?
1794	Can you tell the people of Newfoundland and Labrador exactly what rights we have under this agreement to sell our power to markets other than Quebec, and whether those rights can ever be restricted by Quebec?
1795	Why sign another 50-year deal?
1796	It is our resource, so why does Quebec still seem to be in the driver seat (allowing us certain rights)?
1797	Are we pressing for a power corridor through Quebec just as Alberta has through BC?
1798	Who is responsible for any cost overruns during construction of the various phases?
1799	Who is responsible for the construction (manages execution)?
1800	What assumptions are used in the financial evaluation, including construction cost and schedule, engineering maturity, ramp-up to full production, energy-sale revenue, the CAD–USD exchange rate and the NPV discount rate?
1801	What mechanisms are included to adjust the price sold to Quebec over time?
1802	Does the MOU assume all phases must proceed to have a finalized agreement (Churchill Falls expansion, Gull Island, Wind Project)?
1803	How much power will NL have control over to distribute through Quebec to other customers and when will that be available?
1804	What specific provisions in this new agreement guarantee that, 30 or 40 years from now, we will still have the freedom to decide where our Churchill Falls electricity goes and how we develop Labrador's economy?
1805	Why is the CF renegotiation tied to other developments?
1806	[IDENTIFIER REDACTED] and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED]'s, among other well respected and educated Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, have expressed immense concern with the current and previous deals, and have put substantial resources behind exploring options and considerations. Why are these efforts seemingly being ignored?
1807	Premier, if Labrador develops major mining, processing and other energy-intensive industries over the next 30 years, what happens if those industries need substantially more electricity than this agreement allows Newfoundland and Labrador to keep?
1808	Will we have the right to take additional power from Churchill Falls for our own economic development, or will we have to go back to Quebec and negotiate for our own resource?
1809	Ratepayers on the island should see a reduction in rates. Quebec and Labrador see great rates. Why not NL?
1810	What is the rush? NL holds all the cards - Quebec has no other viable alternative, and the longer we delay the stronger our bargaining position becomes.
1811	If the Innu Nation membership raises concerns that are different from the leadership, will those concerns be addressed and taken seriously?
1812	Given that this is a nation building project and cabinet has a right to override Indigenous consultations, will the concerns of the Innu be addressed throughout the length of the project?
1813	Given that Prime Minister Carney has exempted energy projects from environmental review, how will environmental concerns and problems be accessed?
1814	If environmental concerns emerge throughout the life of the project that the federal Cabinet has not addressed up front, how do we know they will be addressed?
1815	Will the electricity be used to power or build data centres?
1816	How do we know the grid for the delivery of this energy will be a clean grid?
1817	How do we know fossil fuels will not be used on the grid?
1818	Will you seek injunctions to police Indigenous and environmental protesters?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1819	Will you use the RCMP or RNC to police Indigenous and environmental protesters?
1820	Why do we not have anyone remotely qualified in any competent measure to negotiate this?
1821	How is a 50-year agreement advantageous?
1822	Why not wait until 2041 for full expiration then punitively sell hydro to Quebec?
1823	Is 2041 really that far away?
1824	Why is it members of our province will pay such a high cost for electricity when Quebec does not?
1825	How does tying increases in the price we charge Quebec for our electricity production to the CPI make any sense? A true inflation adjustment mechanism has to be based on actual increases in electricity market prices not the Consumer Price Index.
1826	If electricity market prices increase substantially over the life of the contract, and the increases are over and above the CPI increases, how do we benefit from significant market price increases?
1827	Why is the agreement for such a long time?
1828	50 years is a very long commitment. Why are we not receiving a larger share of the benefits?
1829	Why does the Agreement need to be for a term of 50 years; why not make it shorter?
1830	Why are the power rates for selling power to Quebec fixed or tied to 2% inflation rather than tied to annual market rates?
1831	Why is the term of the Churchill Falls agreement 50 years?
1832	Why can't it be a shorter term like 20 or 25 years with an option to renew for another 25 years?
1833	Why do Newfoundland pay 16 cents kw and Quebec pay 8 cents kw?
1834	Why are we not getting a referendum vote on this decision as was promised by the current premier when he was campaigning?
1835	Are we getting electricity for the same price as the people in Quebec?
1836	What are the big changes from the previous government's MOU?
1837	Why is the market price mechanism not completely linked to the market gate price of electricity for the duration of the agreement?
1838	Who will have priority on power generated if there is not enough water for full capacity at either Churchill Falls or Gull Island?
1839	Why are we not negotiating two agreements?
1840	First one for our provincial asset of Churchill Falls and afterwards a second on Gull Island?
1841	My question is just why can't Newfoundland a population of just over 500 thousand have the same rate as Quebec for our electricity rates?
1842	There are a lot of well educated citizens of this province who should be given the opportunity to be part of the decision-making process to have our voices heard before any decision is made that effects all of our futures, so why can't we have that election promise?
1843	Why does this deal have to be locked in for such a long period of time?
1844	Can't there be reviews every 5 years to ensure that we are not being manipulated or getting anything less than we deserve?
1845	Why is Quebec getting so much on future development?
1846	How come there is no rate term period, for example if you take out a mortgage with a bank there is an amortization period of 20 or 25 years with the term to be reviewed say EVERY five years?
1847	Why make a deal with Quebec, we don't need their transmission lines?
1848	Why don't we engage with the major hyperscalers and become an AI superpower?
1849	What research has been done on alternative methods of delivering electricity and what methods are in development?
1850	Has the province sought customers other than Quebec?
1851	Has the province sought investors other than Quebec?
1852	Has the province sought developers other than Quebec?
1853	Why did the government agree to the rate of inflation rather than fair market value to determine its financial return?
1854	Given the rate of technological development, did the government consider a shorter term contract?
1855	Why does the Premier frame the negotiations as 'sharing' our hydroelectric resource rather than consider it the province's resource which it has every right to sell to the highest bidder, as it does every other NL produced commodity or resource?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1856	Can a provincial committee consisting of representatives from all political parties be struck to negotiate the deal?
1857	Of the 25,000 jobs which result from this development, realistically how many people from this province have/will have the skills and are likely to be employed?
1858	Once the construction is completed, how many people will be employed for annual operations?
1859	Are Government members open minded and ready to consider ideas from its citizens or are they to 'sell' the current arrangement?
1860	Does the premier subscribe to the PM's assertion that "No deal is better than a bad deal"?
1861	Will it be another 65 years before this province has the opportunity to be masters in our own house?
1862	Will the cost overruns from Muskrat Falls still haunt NL and Lab if this deal sees the light of day?
1863	Will existing rate-mitigation measures continue after 2030 and, if so, how much could electricity rates increase despite the new agreement?
1864	Why does the new Churchill Falls MOU not have 5-year opening clause mechanism into the MOU so that electricity price rates are reviewed every 5 years and the price per kWh paid by Quebec to NL are based on the true market price paid for electricity at the time of each 5-year review?
1865	I am very concerned that the MOU debate next week will not clarify anything and, because the main parties are already in agreement, will not even be a useful debate so why have it?
1866	With all due respect to House of Assembly members, none have the knowledge or expertise to make such a decision so why is one being made?
1867	Again, why is a decision being made by the House at this time?
1868	Again, why is the process being rushed through?
1869	Why go ahead with something that will potentially have severe consequences to the entire NL population without proper, knowledgeable, well-considered, professional consideration?
1870	There is much smoke and mirrors in this MOU-political tub-thumping and cheering in the House is not the way to make a decent, fair and considered decision, Do you not agree?
1871	Do you agree that the longer NL waits it out the better will be the outcome for the Newfoundland and Labrador population?
1872	Do you agree that this MOU is a give-away?
1873	Do you not agree that a 50-year contract is ridiculous, just like the 1969 one?
1874	Will the definitive agreements include ironclad mechanisms for Newfoundland and Labrador to be able to buy back part of and eventually all of Hydro-Québec's equity position in Churchill Falls and Gull Island Projects in future?
1875	If a mechanism / pathway for the buyback of HQ's equity at some point in the future is not or will not be part of this agreement why is NL giving up ownership of ~36% of the power from Churchill Falls and Gull Island forever even if the energy requirements for NL from these developments surpasses the ~64% that NL will own of the total 9400 MW power from these projects?
1876	The DCIA appears to even more solidify HQs ownership position forever. Annex K - Governance Principles and its Exhibit B KEY PRINCIPLES FOR POST-PPA PROCESS is already laying out post PPA process one that seems to totally remove NL government and NLH from controlling the post PPA process, "NLH will always be guaranteed to be provided the maximum volumes to which NLH is entitled under the new PPAs (the "Guaranteed Volumes") so long as it pays market price as revealed in the Post-PPA Process.NLH will not be deemed to be participating in the Post-PPA Process solely by virtue of securing its Guaranteed Volumes, provided that such Guaranteed Volumes are secured at the market price determined in the Post-PPA Process." Is Annex K and Exhibit B stating that the post PPA process / next PPA (2077-?) price for electricity will be market-based as determined by project board of directors / independent governance process and NLH will only be able to secure the electricity if it buys it at market price?
1877	If market-based pricing will be put in place post PPA (after most of Gull Island is amortized) why is that same independent process of board of directors not being used now to establish market price for the existing CF plant and energy in this PPA?
1878	NL will own 6,031 MW (64.1%) of power from CF & GI, Federal Government is saying electrical demand will double by 2050, in what year is NL's total electrical load forecasted to exceed the 6,031 MW from these developments, and at which point we will have to pay HQ for electricity at market-based prices?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1879	Annex K clause 14 Eligible Canadian Pension Fund Transfer. "Notwithstanding Section 13, NLH and HQ agree that they will both have the ability to do a one-time transfer of up to 10% of the voting shares of each of CF(L)Co and GIJVE to an Eligible Canadian Pension Fund (includes Public Service Pension Plan (PSPP) and the Teachers' Pension Plan (TPP) of Newfoundland and Labrador)." Is our Government already considering selling 10% of NL ownership to Pension funds and if so at what price and for what reason and will this establish a terrible precedent for the valuation of those shares for the time when NL, hopefully someday in the future, takes back some or all of HQ's equity position?
1880	Can you advise as to the exact wording for the escalator clause in the Churchill Falls Agreement?
1881	Given that there is disclosure on NL's estimated profits, what are the estimated profits for Quebec using those same estimates for the same period?
1882	Given that the previous deal was deemed unfair due to Quebec making [sometimes] tenfold profits compared with NL, is there any protection against Quebec getting a lopsided share in the new deal?
1883	Is there a re-opener clause in the event of unforeseen circumstances that could render the deal lopsided?
1884	What about the promised referendum? It was the basis of their campaign.
1885	When the Gull Island plant is completed, who will be the owners and what will the share of ownership be?
1886	Why is everyone but Newfoundland going to get rich off this deal?
1887	Why do we have to give everything away, the same as before?
1888	Why are we signing a long-term deal?
1889	Why isn't there an escalator clause in the contract?
1890	Why are the people of Newfoundland and Labrador getting such a small percentage of the power from this deal?
1891	Why can't we have power rates equal to the people of Quebec?
1892	What minimum amount of power is guaranteed to Newfoundland and Labrador, and what does "up to 2,350 MW" mean in practical and enforceable terms?
1893	Are the 985 MW of transmission rights firm, and what compensation applies if access is unavailable?
1894	What protections prevent Hydro-Québec from using its transmission or purchasing position to disadvantage Newfoundland and Labrador?
1895	How will the $49 billion net-present-value figure be calculated, audited and reported?
1896	What portion of future increases in the real market value of Churchill River electricity will remain with Newfoundland and Labrador?
1897	What protections apply if Gull Island, the wind project or transmission projects are delayed, cancelled or exceed their budgets?
1898	How will the 85 per cent employment guarantee be enforced and independently verified?
1899	What specific equity, revenue-sharing, employment and procurement opportunities will be available to the Innu Nation?
1900	What independent governance and conflict-of-interest protections will apply?
1901	Will the final agreements include mandatory 10- or 15-year economic reviews?
1902	How long will the Churchill River Electricity Rebate remain in effect, and how will it be protected for future ratepayers?
1903	Will the final agreements be made public before they are approved and signed?
1904	My question is, what changed?
1905	We need to move fast! Fast for whom?
1906	Is there a commitment to getting answers to the questions I posted?
1907	Why do we need such a long-term deal with Quebec on this MOU?
1908	Newfoundland and Labrador should own the biggest percentage of this deal, not Quebec. Is this going to happen or is Quebec going to get more benefits from this MOU than Newfoundland and Labrador again?
1909	Why are we not going to get electricity at 8 cents per kilowatt-hour like Quebec is getting?
1910	Why didn't they reduce our rates for electricity?
1911	My understanding is that, in the first MOU, Quebec would own around 10 miles at the Gull Island site (maybe even the actual generation site as well). Was that the case and is this the same in this MOU?
1912	Why can't the government do a comparative breakdown of the main beneficiaries of this deal over its duration?
1913	Who benefits the most dollar for dollar?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1914	Who maintains control of the projects during engineering, procurement and construction phases and post-commissioning?
1915	Why are we not insisting that the multiple projects be separate contracts?
1916	Any other arrangement will lead to confusion and ultimately cost overruns. Why wouldn't we be looking at doing the existing powerhouse upgrades ourselves?
1917	It seems to be the cheapest option to get 1,200 MW of power for all this reported industry going in Labrador over the coming years. Why all the hype about a few thousand temporary jobs created during construction?
1918	The NL people need to hear from the government as to who the author of this great deal was. Who penned it?
1919	Considering the government's lack of experience in this field, was there any thought given to seeking advice and recommendations from Newfoundland Power?
1920	How exactly will the rebate work?
1921	Will cheques be issued through the government or through NL Power?
1922	How exactly will Indigenous peoples be incorporated into planning and benefits?
1923	The change to a House debate (four days) and House vote instead of a referendum voted on by the citizens of the province. Why have you broken this election promise?
1924	Is it because you now have a majority?
1925	Is your present government now unsure of the possible outcome of having a referendum?
1926	What is the difference?
1927	Is the MOU and federal government AGAIN allowing Quebec to roll Newfoundland and Labrador power through Quebec but denying NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR FULL TRANSMISSION RIGHTS and FULL BENEFITS OF ITS POWER?
1928	WHY IS IT BEING ALLOWED?
1929	IS THERE OR IS THERE NOT A REOPENING CLAUSE IN THIS MOU?
1930	WHY IS HISTORY BEING ALLOWED TO REPEAT ITSELF?
1931	IF THERE IS A REOPENING CLAUSE -- WHAT DOES IT STATE?
1932	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS FOR NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR?
1933	ACCESSIBILITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES How inclusive is government when it is requesting citizen input using various forms of communication across a variety of platforms?
1934	How many people are being denied access and participation?
1935	Why are you settling for a ridiculous 50-year deal?
1936	I would like to know why the government is locking us into a 50-year contract with no reopening clause?
1937	Why the rush? It is very important we get this right!
1938	What is Newfoundland and Labrador getting from this MOU?
1939	Does the proposed new MOU with Quebec regarding the Churchill Falls agreement contain an escalator clause?
1940	Premier, given that much of the existing environmental information concerning the Churchill River dates back to 2012, will your government require a new, comprehensive and independent environmental assessment before further major development proceeds, and will lessons from environmental impacts associated with Muskrat Falls that were underestimated, unexpected or inadequately monitored be incorporated into decisions about further development of the Churchill River? If not, why does the government believe the existing environmental information is sufficient?
1941	What assessment has your government made of the social, cultural and community impacts of further development, including impacts on fishing, hunting, travel, traditional activities, food security, mental well-being and people's relationship with the Churchill River?
1942	Is the Energy East project now being revisited?
1943	Was it used as leverage during negotiations in the Churchill Falls discussions?
1944	How can you expect any Newfoundlanders who voted based on your referendum platform to believe their (Québec's) "good intentions" for this newly proposed MOU?
1945	As our representatives, are you prepared to take a stand and advise the Premier to hold a referendum on the MOU and demand that it include costs, in today's dollars, of the negative environmental impacts to Labrador and society as a whole?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1946	Premier Wakeham committed that Newfoundland and Labrador would be the “principal beneficiary” of Churchill Falls following his renegotiation of Premier Furey’s Memorandum of Understanding. Was this commitment achieved, and what key elements distinguish this outcome?
1947	Neither MOU1 nor MOU2 require market prices for Churchill Falls power over the 51-year term. If Newfoundland and Labrador owns 65.8% of CFLCo and holds the water rights that facilitate power generation, why has the Wakeham Government agreed to a deal that some analysts view as lopsided in favour of Quebec?
1948	Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] have stated that MOU2 gives Newfoundland and Labrador more access to 950 MW of electricity than MOU1. However, MOU2 appears to deliver no additional energy from the existing Churchill Falls plant, with future access dependent on uncertain Gull Island and wind development. Why does the government characterize this as increased access to power?
1949	Over the 51-year term, Quebec will receive about 75% of power production from Churchill Falls, and potentially more if Gull Island and wind projects do not proceed. How does this benefit Newfoundland and Labrador?
1950	Both MOU1 and MOU2 provide for expanded capacity at Churchill Falls on a cost-of-service basis, meaning Newfoundland and Labrador may not receive market value for the additional power or capacity produced. On what basis does this arrangement make sense for Newfoundland and Labrador?
1951	MOU2 commits most Churchill Falls power to Quebec at a relatively low net cost while Gull Island and wind power are expected to be much more expensive. How does selling lower-cost power to Hydro-Québec while potentially accessing higher-cost power benefit Newfoundland and Labrador industry or ratepayers?
1952	Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] have highlighted wheeling rights for Churchill Falls power, but some analysts state that only a limited portion can be moved for direct sales and that certain rights predated MOU2. Why has the government described these rights as a major gain?
1953	Premier Wakeham and [IDENTIFIER REDACTED] have stated that MOU2 offers indexation based on the Consumer Price Index, while several analysts argue that the inflation adjustment mechanism provides little protection against electricity price inflation. How does the government respond to these concerns?
1954	Why did Premier Wakeham not require reciprocal transmission rights from Quebec, particularly given open-access principles that apply in other electricity markets?
1955	Having failed to secure transmission rights through Quebec to reach third-party customers, are MHAs content that Newfoundland and Labrador should have limited access to external markets?
1956	Do you agree that the negotiating committee representing Newfoundland and Labrador was less experienced than the team representing Hydro-Québec?
1957	Exhibit C of MOU2 prevents the Newfoundland and Labrador Government from adjusting water royalties and other levies for 51 years. Why has Premier Wakeham accepted this limitation on the province’s resource revenues?
1958	Analysts have concluded that much of the Churchill Falls energy continues to be sold to Hydro-Québec below today’s replacement cost for many years. Is this consistent with the commitment that Newfoundland and Labrador would be the principal beneficiary of Churchill Falls?
1959	The Independent Review Committee recommended strategic guidance and preparations before further negotiations with Hydro-Québec, but the Wakeham Government proceeded quickly with a new negotiating committee. Do you agree this approach contributed to the outcome achieved?
1960	The Independent Review Committee and other analysts recommended unbundling the MOU so each component could be assessed separately. Given the value and length of the proposed agreement, do you still support MOU2 as a bundled 51-year agreement?
1961	During the last general election, Premier Wakeham promised that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians would have a say through a referendum on any deal with Quebec. Are you prepared to advise the Premier to hold a referendum on the MOU?
1962	Do you plan to support Premier Wakeham’s MOU2 during debate in the House of Assembly, and would you vote with the government if members are asked to indicate support for the deal?
1963	Given the estimated market value of energy from Churchill Falls and Newfoundland and Labrador’s ownership and water rights, how do you justify the level of return to the province under MOU2?
1964	Given Newfoundland and Labrador’s high per-capita public debt and the revenue potential of Churchill Falls, why would an elected member support an arrangement that critics argue limits the province’s opportunity to improve its financial position?

Churchill Falls Agreement — Questions

Questions were edited for grammar, clarity and formatting without changing meaning or tone. Exact and substantive duplicate questions were consolidated, and dependent follow-up questions were combined where appropriate. Personal identifiers have been redacted where necessary to protect respondent privacy.

Question #	Question
1965	It is very concerning that the government is still planning to go ahead with the Churchill Falls-Gull Island project without a new Environmental Assessment. This even though we now know much more about the impacts that mega hydro projects have on the climate locally, regionally and globally. Governments and proponents are not divulging the science behind these impacts. Has government forgotten the impact of these catastrophic events?
1966	Have Indigenous groups been fully informed and their expert input included?
1967	How can we move forward with a project of this magnitude without assessing all impacts using the best and most current available scientific information?