Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act (PAMTA) – H.R. 1587



PAMTA has the potential to adversely affect food security and safety and to substantially limit the ability of veterinarians to protect animal health and welfare.

KEY POINTS:

- H.R. 1587 defines several necessary uses of antimicrobials in food animals as unlawful, substantially limiting the ability of veterinarians to care for their patients and ensure a safe food supply.
- Many provisions in the bill have already been addressed by the 2017 FDA regulatory changes which were designed to preserve the effectiveness of antimicrobials in humans and animals.
- The AVMA supports the Food and Drug Administration's implementation of the Veterinary Feed Directive rule and Guidance for Industry (GFI) No.s 209 and 213, which increase veterinary oversight of the use of antimicrobials in food animals and prohibit the use of antimicrobials for growth promotion and feed efficiency. AVMA also supports FDA GFI No. 152, which provides a framework for assessing the safety of antimicrobial drugs for use in animals with regard to their potential effects on human health.

What is the intent of this bill?

The stated purpose of the bill is to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials used in the treatment of human and animal diseases. The bill would prohibit administration of medically important antimicrobials through feed or water to an animal for growth promotion or feed efficiency purposes (already prohibited by FDA as of January 1, 2017). The bill also prohibits disease prevention and most disease control uses of medically important antimicrobials in animals, which AVMA believes are important tools for maintaining the health and welfare of animals. H.R.

1587 would amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act to greatly increase the requirements for drug manufacturers to prove the safety of animal drugs regarding development of antimicrobial resistance and human health.

What is the problem?

The bill contradicts and is out of sync with FDA regulatory changes implemented in 2016 and 2017 that address the same issues. It removes the veterinarian's flexibility to make decisions in the best interest of animals and food safety. In addition, the bill sets nearly unattainable requirements for proving the safety of animal drugs, which could remove from the market many antimicrobials necessary for treatment, prevention and control of disease in veterinary patients.

Why is AVMA opposed?

The bill prohibits all prevention and most control uses of antimicrobials in food animals, particularly administered in feed or water. Prevention and control (as well as treatment) of disease under the supervision of a veterinarian are critical tools for maintaining animal health and assuring a safe and healthy food supply. In some situations, delivery in feed or water may be the most appropriate and effective way to administer medication to the animals that need it. This bill would limit the ability of trained and licensed veterinarians to make the decisions necessary in their daily work to protect animal health and welfare.

AVMA supports FDA GFI 152, which provides guidance for assessing the safety of animal drugs regarding human health and antimicrobial resistance, and GFI No.s 209 and 213 which delineate two principles for judicious usage of antimicrobials in food animals. The first principle is to limit the use of medically important



antimicrobials in food animals to treatment, prevention and control uses, and to prohibit production uses (growth promotion and feed efficiency). The second principle is to increase veterinary oversight of the use of medically important antimicrobials in food animals, which was implemented through the Veterinary Feed Directive rule. These regulations, which address the same issues as the stated purpose of H.R. 1587, came into effect as recently as January 1, 2017 and will require time and space to have an effect.

Status of the bill:

 Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-N.Y.-25) introduced the bill on March 16, 2017, and it has been referred to the House Energy and Commerce Committee.

