



American Veterinary Medical Association Governmental Relations Division

1910 Sunderland Place NW, Washington, DC 20036-1642

Phone 202.789.0007 / 800.321.1473 Fax 202.842.4360

www.avma.org

H.R. 1150, Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act (PAMTA) of 2013

AVMA Position: Active Pursuit of Defeat

Background:

H.R. 1150, Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act (PAMTA) of 2013 would amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to purportedly preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials.

The 113th Congressional version of the bill has several changes from previous iterations:

- (1) The legislation now includes cephalosporins, bringing the total to eight classes of medically-important antibiotics that would be banned from “non-therapeutic uses”. Also banned would be any kind of penicillin, tetracycline, macrolide, lincosamide, streptogramin, aminoglycoside, or sulfonamide; and,
- (2) The legislation also defines the term “non-therapeutic use” within the context of new terminology. The term ‘nontherapeutic use’ means administration of antibiotics to an animal through feed and water (or, in poultry hatcheries, through any means) for purposes (such as growth promotion, feed efficiency, weight gain, or disease prevention) other than therapeutic use or nonroutine disease control; and includes any repeated or regular pattern of use of medically important antimicrobials for purposes other than therapeutic use or nonroutine disease control.
 - a. “Nonroutine disease control” means the use of antibiotics on an animal that is not sick but where it can be shown that a particular disease or infection is present, or is likely to occur because of a specific, noncustomary situation, on the premises at the barn, house, pen, or other level at which the animal is kept.
 - b. “Noncustomary situation” does not include normal or standard practice and conditions on the premises that facilitate the transmission of disease.

Justification:

AVMA recognizes the importance and complexity of antimicrobial resistance as well as the controversies over potential causes and possible means for mitigation. The bill, if passed as written, would be unreasonably deleterious to animal health and welfare. While the legislation proposes to eliminate certain uses of antimicrobials defined as “non-therapeutic”, yet still allowing “therapeutic use” and “nonroutine disease control” uses of antimicrobials, has the potential to severely limit the ability of veterinarians to ensure optimal animal health and welfare.

While AVMA continues to engage with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on antimicrobial resistance, the legislation fails to recognize the work being done by the FDA on this issue. The legislation also references antimicrobial classes listed by the World Health Organization instead of guidance and regulations of the FDA.

At the same time, a ban as this legislation proposes is not risk-based; the provisions in H.R. 1150 are contrary to the practice of veterinary medicine; the terms defined for antimicrobial use are not recognized within the veterinary community nor in current regulatory language; and the legislative language is counter to the principles in the AVMA’s policies related to the Judicious Therapeutic Use of Antimicrobials.

AVMA Contact:

Dr. Ashley Morgan, Assistant Director, Governmental Relations Division, 202-289-3210, amorgan@avma.org.

The AVMA is the recognized voice for the profession, representing over 84,000 member veterinarians. The objective of the AVMA is to advance the science and art of veterinary medicine including its relationship to public health, biological science, and agriculture.