

## Response to Bill HR 1406 – Pet medication issues

1. Retailers offer significant savings to pet owners. Some vet's charge 100% - 300% markups.
2. A licensed pharmacy is not a "diversion" and is governed by each state's human and animal pharmacy laws.
3. Pfizer and Eli Lilly want to claim that they are enforcing vet-client relationships. In the case of a license pharmacy the vet writing the prescription fulfills this relationship before writing the prescription. Animal Pharm (our licensed pharmacy) cannot purchase from these companies. This in effect makes a vet write a prescription for some other product – maybe not his first choice to treat the pet. It also allows the vet a monopoly on these products and raises the markup to the pet owner.
4. Licensed pharmacies are devalued in the present system of pet pharmaceutical sales. If human pharmacies were treated this way, physicians would still be dispensing most human products.
5. HR 1406 would cure many of the problems of distribution of pet pharmaceuticals. Comparison to FCLCA (lens law) and human pharmacy laws would be tutorial
6. HR1406 is needed to enhance portability issues that certainly are flagrant today.
7. I am a licensed vet of 54 years in Iowa. Animal Pharmacy was required by Iowa law to continue dispensing pet medications in 1995. Animal Pharm has a licensed pharmacist and 2 certified pharmacy techs to send product to pet owners in the 40 states that we are licensed in. HR 1406 is needed to put portability in the whole industry.

If 54 years of experience in the animal pharmacy distribution would be of any value. I would be willing to appear personally, by phone or electronically to answer any questions. It has been troubling to me to watch some pharmaceutical companies (Pfizer & Eli Lilly) and most of my profession fight to keep a monopoly in pet medication distribution. This taints my profession and clearly causes pet owners significantly higher prices for the care of their pets.