

110TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 962

To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 8, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce

A BILL

To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to preserve the effectiveness of medically important antibiotics used in the treatment of human and animal diseases.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 **SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.**

4 (a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the
5 “Preservation of Antibiotics for Medical Treatment Act of
6 2007”.

7 (b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of
8 this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings.
Sec. 3. Purpose.

TITLE I—SAFETY OF CRITICAL ANTIMICROBIAL ANIMAL DRUGS

- Sec. 101. Proof of safety of critical antimicrobial animal drugs.

TITLE II—USE OF CRITICAL ANTIMICROBIAL ANIMAL DRUGS IN
AGRICULTURE

- Sec. 201. Collection of data on critical antimicrobial animal drugs.

1 **SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

2 The Congress finds that—

3 (1)(A) in January 2001, a Federal interagency
4 task force released an action plan to address the
5 continuing decline in effectiveness of antibiotics
6 against common bacterial infections, referred to as
7 antibiotic resistance;

8 (B) the task force determined that antibiotic re-
9 sistance is a growing menace to all people and poses
10 a serious threat to public health; and

11 (C) the task force cautioned that if current
12 trends continue, treatments for common infections
13 will become increasingly limited and expensive, and,
14 in some cases, nonexistent;

15 (2) antibiotic resistance, resulting in a reduced
16 number of effective antibiotics, may significantly im-
17 pair the ability of the United States to respond to
18 terrorist attacks involving bacterial infections or a
19 large influx of hospitalized patients;

1 (3)(A) any overuse or misuse of antibiotics con-
2 tributes to the spread of antibiotic resistance, wheth-
3 er in human medicine or in agriculture; and

4 (B) recognizing the public health threat caused
5 by antibiotic resistance, Congress took several steps
6 to curb antibiotic overuse in human medicine
7 through amendments to the Public Health Service
8 Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) made by section 102 of
9 the Public Health Threats and Emergencies Act
10 (Public Law 106–505, title I; 114 Stat. 2315), but
11 has not yet addressed antibiotic overuse in agri-
12 culture;

13 (4) in a March 2003 report, the National Acad-
14 emy of Sciences stated that—

15 (A) a decrease in antimicrobial use in
16 human medicine alone will have little effect on
17 the current situation; and

18 (B) substantial efforts must be made to
19 decrease inappropriate overuse in animals and
20 agriculture;

21 (5)(A) an estimated 70 percent of the anti-
22 biotics and other antimicrobial drugs used in the
23 United States are fed to farm animals for nonthera-
24 peutic purposes, including—

25 (i) growth promotion; and

1 (ii) compensation for crowded, unsanitary,
2 and stressful farming and transportation condi-
3 tions; and

4 (B) unlike human use of antibiotics, these non-
5 therapeutic uses in animals typically do not require
6 a prescription;

7 (6)(A) many scientific studies confirm that the
8 nontherapeutic use of antibiotics in agricultural ani-
9 mals contributes to the development of antibiotic-re-
10 sistant bacterial infections in people;

11 (B) the periodical entitled “Clinical Infectious
12 Diseases” published a report in June 2002, based on
13 a 2-year review by experts in human and veterinary
14 medicine, public health, microbiology, biostatistics,
15 and risk analysis, of more than 500 scientific studies
16 on the human health impacts of antimicrobial use in
17 agriculture; and

18 (C) the report recommended that antimicrobial
19 agents should no longer be used in agriculture in the
20 absence of disease, but should be limited to therapy
21 for diseased individual animals and prophylaxis
22 when disease is documented in a herd or flock;

23 (7) the United States Geological Survey re-
24 ported in March 2002 that—

1 (A) antibiotics were present in 48 percent
2 of the streams tested nationwide; and

3 (B) almost half of the tested streams were
4 downstream from agricultural operations;

5 (8) an April 1999 study by the General Ac-
6 counting Office concluded that resistant strains of 3
7 microorganisms that cause food-borne illness or dis-
8 ease in humans—Salmonella, Campylobacter, and E.
9 coli—are linked to the use of antibiotics in animals;

10 (9)(A) in January 2003, Consumer Reports
11 published test results on poultry products bought in
12 grocery stores nationwide showing disturbingly high
13 levels of Campylobacter and Salmonella bacteria that
14 were resistant to antibiotics used to treat food-borne
15 illnesses; and

16 (B) further studies showed similar results in
17 other meat products;

18 (10) in October 2001, the New England Jour-
19 nal of Medicine published an editorial urging a ban
20 on nontherapeutic use of medically important anti-
21 biotics in animals;

22 (11)(A) in 1999, the European Union banned
23 the practice of feeding medically important anti-
24 biotics to animals other than for disease treatment
25 or control, and prior to that, individual European

1 countries had banned the use of specific antibiotics
2 in animal feed; and

3 (B) those countries have experienced no signifi-
4 cant impact on animal health or productivity, food
5 safety, or meat prices, and more importantly, levels
6 of resistant bacteria have declined sharply;

7 (12) in 1998, the National Academy of Sciences
8 noted that antibiotic-resistant bacteria generate a
9 minimum of \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 in
10 costs to United States society and individuals yearly;

11 (13) a year later, the National Academy of
12 Sciences estimated that eliminating the use of all
13 antibiotics as feed additives would cost each Amer-
14 ican consumer less than \$5 to \$10 per year;

15 (14) the American Medical Association, the
16 American Public Health Association, the National
17 Association of County and City Health Officials, and
18 the National Campaign for Sustainable Agriculture,
19 are among the more than 300 organizations rep-
20 resenting health, consumer, agricultural, environ-
21 mental, humane, and other interests that support
22 enactment of legislation to phase out nontherapeutic
23 use in farm animals of medically important anti-
24 biotics;

1 (15) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
2 (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.)—

3 (A) requires that all drugs be shown to be
4 safe before the drugs are approved; and

5 (B) places the burden on manufacturers to
6 account for health consequences and prove safe-
7 ty;

8 (16)(A) the Food and Drug Administration re-
9 cently modified the drug approval process for anti-
10 biotics to recognize the development of resistant bac-
11 teria as an important aspect of safety;

12 (B) however, most antibiotics currently used in
13 animal production systems for nontherapeutic pur-
14 poses were approved before the Food and Drug Ad-
15 ministration began giving in-depth consideration to
16 resistance during the drug-approval process; and

17 (C) the Food and Drug Administration has not
18 established a schedule for reviewing those existing
19 approvals; and

20 (17) certain non-routine uses of antibiotics in
21 animal agriculture are legitimate to prevent animal
22 disease; and

23 (18)(A) an April 2004 study by the General Ac-
24 counting Office concluded that Federal agencies do
25 not collect the critical data on antibiotic use in ani-

1 “(A) any kind of penicillin, tetracycline,
2 macrolide, lincosamide, streptogramin,
3 aminoglycoside, or sulfonamide; or

4 “(B) any other drug or derivative of a
5 drug that is used in humans or intended for use
6 in humans to treat or prevent disease or infec-
7 tion caused by microorganisms.

8 “(ss) NONTHERAPEUTIC USE.—The term ‘nonthera-
9 peutic use’, with respect to a critical antimicrobial animal
10 drug, means any use of the drug as a feed or water addi-
11 tive for an animal in the absence of any clinical sign of
12 disease in the animal for growth promotion, feed effi-
13 ciency, weight gain, routine disease prevention, or other
14 routine purpose.”.

15 (b) APPLICATIONS PENDING OR SUBMITTED AFTER
16 ENACTMENT.—Section 512(d)(1) of the Federal Food,
17 Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 360b(d)(1)) is amend-
18 ed—

19 (1) in the first sentence—

20 (A) in subparagraph (H), by striking “or”
21 at the end;

22 (B) by redesignating subparagraph (I) as
23 subparagraph (J); and

24 (C) by inserting after subparagraph (H)
25 the following:

1 “(I) with respect to a critical antimicrobial
2 animal drug or a drug of the same chemical
3 class as a critical antimicrobial animal drug,
4 the applicant has failed to demonstrate that
5 there is a reasonable certainty of no harm to
6 human health due to the development of anti-
7 microbial resistance that is attributable, in
8 whole or in part, to the nontherapeutic use of
9 the drug; or”;

10 (2) in the second sentence, by striking “(A)
11 through (I)” and inserting “(A) through (J)”.

12 (c) PHASED ELIMINATION OF NONTHERAPEUTIC
13 USE IN ANIMALS OF CRITICAL ANTIMICROBIAL ANIMAL
14 DRUGS IMPORTANT FOR HUMAN HEALTH.—Section 512
15 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C.
16 360b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

17 “(q) PHASED ELIMINATION OF NONTHERAPEUTIC
18 USE IN ANIMALS OF CRITICAL ANTIMICROBIAL ANIMAL
19 DRUGS IMPORTANT FOR HUMAN HEALTH.—

20 “(1) APPLICABILITY.—This subsection applies
21 to the nontherapeutic use in a food-producing ani-
22 mal of a drug—

23 “(A)(i) that is a critical antimicrobial ani-
24 mal drug; or

1 “(ii) that is of the same chemical class as
2 a critical antimicrobial animal drug; and

3 “(B)(i) for which there is in effect an ap-
4 proval of an application or an exemption under
5 subsection (b), (i), or (j) of section 505; or

6 “(ii) that is otherwise marketed for use.

7 “(2) WITHDRAWAL.—The Secretary shall with-
8 draw the approval of a nontherapeutic use in food-
9 producing animals described in paragraph (1) on the
10 date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of
11 this subsection unless—

12 “(A) before the date that is 2 years after
13 the date of the enactment of this subsection,
14 the Secretary makes a final written determina-
15 tion that the holder of the approved application
16 has demonstrated that there is a reasonable
17 certainty of no harm to human health due to
18 the development of antimicrobial resistance that
19 is attributable in whole or in part to the non-
20 therapeutic use of the drug; or

21 “(B) before the date specified in subpara-
22 graph (A), the Secretary makes a final written
23 determination under this subsection, with re-
24 spect to a risk analysis of the drug conducted
25 by the Secretary and other relevant informa-

1 tion, that there is a reasonable certainty of no
2 harm to human health due to the development
3 of antimicrobial resistance that is attributable
4 in whole or in part to the nontherapeutic use of
5 the drug.

6 “(3) EXEMPTIONS.—Except as provided in
7 paragraph (5), if the Secretary grants an exemption
8 under section 505(i) for a drug that is a critical
9 antimicrobial animal drug, the Secretary shall re-
10 scind each approval of a nontherapeutic use in a
11 food-producing animal of the critical antimicrobial
12 animal drug, or of a drug in the same chemical class
13 as the critical antimicrobial animal drug, as of the
14 date that is 2 years after the date on which the Sec-
15 retary grants the exemption.

16 “(4) APPROVALS.—Except as provided in para-
17 graph (5), if an application for a drug that is a crit-
18 ical antimicrobial animal drug is submitted to the
19 Secretary under section 505(b), the Secretary shall
20 rescind each approval of a nontherapeutic use in a
21 food-producing animal of the critical antimicrobial
22 animal drug, or of a drug in the same chemical class
23 as the critical antimicrobial animal drug, as of the
24 date that is 2 years after the date on which the ap-
25 plication is submitted to the Secretary.

1 “(5) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (3) or (4), as the
2 case may be, shall not apply if—

3 “(A) before the date on which approval
4 would be rescinded under that paragraph, the
5 Secretary makes a final written determination
6 that the holder of the application for the ap-
7 proved nontherapeutic use has demonstrated
8 that there is a reasonable certainty of no harm
9 to human health due to the development of
10 antimicrobial resistance that is attributable in
11 whole or in part to the nontherapeutic use in
12 the food-producing animal of the critical anti-
13 microbial animal drug; or

14 “(B) before the date specified in subpara-
15 graph (A), the Secretary makes a final written
16 determination under this subsection, with re-
17 spect to a risk analysis of the critical anti-
18 microbial animal drug conducted by the Sec-
19 retary and any other relevant information, that
20 there is a reasonable certainty of no harm to
21 human health due to the development of anti-
22 microbial resistance that is attributable in
23 whole or in part to the nontherapeutic use of
24 the drug.”.

1 **TITLE II—USE OF CRITICAL**
2 **ANTIMICROBIAL ANIMAL**
3 **DRUGS IN AGRICULTURE**

4 **SEC. 201. COLLECTION OF DATA ON CRITICAL ANTI-**
5 **MICROBIAL ANIMAL DRUGS.**

6 (a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter V of the Federal Food,
7 Drug, and Cosmetic Act is amended by inserting after sec-
8 tion 512 (21 U.S.C. 360b) the following:

9 **“SEC. 512A. COLLECTION OF DATA ON CRITICAL ANTI-**
10 **MICROBIAL ANIMAL DRUGS.**

11 “(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 1 of each
12 year, a manufacturer of a critical antimicrobial animal
13 drug or an animal feed for food-producing animals bearing
14 or containing a critical antimicrobial animal drug shall
15 submit to the Secretary a report, in such form as the Sec-
16 retary shall require, containing information on the sales
17 during the previous calendar year of the critical anti-
18 microbial animal drug or the animal feed.

19 “(b) INFORMATION TO BE INCLUDED.—A report
20 under subsection (a) shall—

21 “(1) state separately the quantity of the critical
22 antimicrobial animal drug, including such quantity
23 in animal feed bearing or containing the critical
24 antimicrobial drug, sold for each kind of food-pro-
25 ducing animal;

1 “(2) describe the claimed purpose of use for the
2 drug for each kind of food-producing animal as
3 being for growth promotion, weight gain, feed effi-
4 ciency, disease prevention, disease control, disease
5 treatment, or another purpose; and

6 “(3) describe the dosage form of the drug.

7 “(c) PUBLICATION.—

8 “(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make
9 the information submitted under subsection (a)
10 available to the public not less than annually.

11 “(2) PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY.—The
12 Secretary may aggregate information, if necessary,
13 so as to avoid disclosure under paragraph (1) of con-
14 fidential business information.”.

15 (b) VIOLATION.—Subsection (e) of section 301 of the
16 Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 331(e))
17 is amended by striking “515(f)” and inserting “512A,
18 515(f)”.

19 (c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by
20 this section shall take effect on January 1, 2008.

○