

Under current provincial plans, at least 71 per cent will not pay one penny more as a result of Bill C-91. Of the remaining 29 per cent, three-quarters or more of their drug costs are covered by provincial drug plans.

I believe what has caused some of the confusion, Mr. Speaker, is that some drug prices are rising faster than the rate of inflation. However, these are not the patented drugs, and this has nothing to do with Bill C-91. Eighty per cent of all drugs are not patented and therefore are not subject to any form of price control. The price increases of the remaining 20 per cent, the patented drugs, are under control and have remained well below the inflation rate, as I mentioned earlier.

The second misconception relates to the cost impact of Bill C-91. The government has been consistent in its projections of what Bill C-91 will cost: \$129 million, in 1990 constant dollars, over the five-year period to 1996. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker: \$129 million. I repeat it because we have heard a great many projections. The opponents of this bill have offered cost projections that have been all over the map.

But Dr. Heinz Redwood, an internationally recognized industry expert, has reviewed our figures. He concludes that they are -- and I will quote him -- "based on acceptable methodology and reasonable assumptions."

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Redwood goes on to say that "the cost to Canada may well turn out to be lower than forecast, thus adding a safety margin for possible but currently unforeseeable additional costs."

So what should we think when Dr. Schondelmeyer, a U.S. economist, appears before the Parliamentary Committee and projects that this Bill will cost Canadians \$7 billion over 17 years? This projection may be sensational. But it is a gross overestimate.

Dr. Schondelmeyer is not an independent or impartial analyst; he was hired by the generic industry some months ago and commissioned by them to perform the analysis of the impact of Bill C-91. He seems to have been extremely limited for time since, I understand, he told the Committee that he did most of the work quickly over the American thanksgiving weekend.

His report included some products that will not even be affected by Bill C-91. His projections do not take into account competition from other patented products, product obsolescence or relevant patent dates. He projected forward 17 years! As experts agree, no one can predict with accuracy beyond five years -- not with the dynamic nature of the medical field. Clearly his approach does not stand up to scrutiny.