The Fairness to Pet Owners Act would place onerous regulatory burdens on veterinarians when there is no indication that this legislation is necessary.

**KEY POINTS:**

- The AVMA supports a client’s right to fill their pet’s prescription at a pharmacy of their choice. This is why the association has maintained a longstanding policy that encourages veterinarians to write a prescription in lieu of dispensing when requested by the client.
- There is no need for a federal mandate as required by HR. 623. Many states already require a veterinarian to honor a client’s request for a prescription.
- This bill will cause undue regulatory and administrative burdens on small business veterinary practices and could potentially raise the costs for pet care.

**What will this bill do?**

H.R. 623 would require a veterinarian to provide a copy of each prescription for a companion animal, whether or not requested by the pet owner. A veterinarian would not be able to: require the client to purchase an animal drug at the clinic for which the veterinarian has written a prescription; charge a client a fee for writing a prescription as part of (or in addition to) the fee for the examination and evaluation of a pet; and/or, require a client to sign, or supply a client with, a waiver or liability disclaimer should the prescription be inaccurately filled by an off-site pharmacy.

**What is the problem?**

There is no need for a legislative mandate such as the one proposed in H.R. 623. Clients already have the flexibility to fill a prescription at their veterinary clinic or off-site at a pharmacy of their choice. A majority of states already have a state law, policy or regulation requiring the veterinarian to honor a client’s request. Similarly, the AVMA’s Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics and its guide on Internet Pharmacies urges veterinarians to write a prescription in lieu of dispensing a medication when requested by the client.

**Why is the AVMA opposed?**

- H.R. 623 will cause undue regulatory and administrative burdens on veterinary practices and possibly increase costs for consumers. Sometimes the client chooses to have his/her veterinarian fill the prescription, but there are also instances when pet medications are only available through a veterinarian. Requiring veterinary practices to handle and process many new, but unnecessary, written prescriptions just to comply with this law will divert time and resources from providing needed care to their animal patients. It is also certainly possible that an increased administrative burden on practices will be passed on in terms of higher costs to consumers, which is definitely something that the veterinary profession wishes to avoid.
- H.R. 623 encroaches on state jurisdiction. State pharmacy and veterinary practice laws already govern compliance by veterinarians to provide prescriptions upon client request.
- While not a reason to deny a client the written prescription, there are challenges the pharmacy community faces when filling veterinary prescriptions. The two medical communities are currently collaborating to protect pet health, but the AVMA believes that veterinarians are still the best resource for professional guidance and education to pet owners with questions regarding their pet’s prescription products.
- This legislation would force veterinarians to conduct and fund marketing on behalf of another industry seeking to increase its market share. As we have seen, the retailers who are looking to expand their pet medication businesses are perfectly capable of informing consumers of their products without federal legislation interfering in the veterinarian-client-patient-relationship.

**Status of the bill:**

- Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah) introduced H.R. 623 on January 24, 2017, and has retired from Congress.
- Veterinarians urge Members of Congress to oppose reintroduction of this unnecessary and burdensome legislative mandate.