cerned solely with this subject that took place here in Washington earlier this year. I spoke at a meeting that the National Academy of Sciences sponsored, and we were specifically talking of these problems. We are concerned about improper use of medicated feeds. For one thing, failure to stop the use of them in adequate time before slaughter to permit clearance from the tissue. Second, we were concerned about general recent findings which suggest that certain medications may persist in the animal tissue far longer than we had ever known heretofore. Some of these feeds are capable of sensitizing human beings to the drugs used so that subsequently the same drug could not be effectively used.

(The information referred to, subsequently received, follows:)

THE QUEST FOR DATA

(Welcoming Remarks by James L. Goddard, M.D., Commissioner of Food and Drugs)

INTRODUCTION

One year ago, you may remember, a report was delivered to me by the Advisory Committee on The Veterinary Medical and Non-Medical Uses of Antibiotics. Several members of that eminent Committee are, I am pleased to see, on the program for this Symposium. The Report was brief and to the point—and gave the Food and Drug Administration a great deal of valuable guidance on new directions we might explore in both research and regulation. I regard the holding of this Symposium as being the same kind of necessary activity in which we must engage in order to gather and evaluate all the research information we can, while moving forward—step-by-step—in our regulatory activity.

Eleven years ago, another Symposium on Medicated Feeds was held by the Food and Drug Administration. The issues raised at that meeting—and the subsequent developments in the use of drugs in animal feeds—have given all of us much to ponder. I think former Commissioner Larrick made a wise decision in organizing the veterinary advisory committee in 1965, for its Report last year was both timely, as far as the state of the art was concerned, and significant, as far as the state of the public health issue was concerned.

And, if I may, I would wish to emphasize that it is the health of the public which must be maintained and which must serve as the ultimate measure of our success, whether in research or regulation. I am sure, as I review your program and your list of speakers and participants, that all of us here today are quite aware of the heavy responsibility we must increasingly assume. I would like to point out, however, that this responsibility is two-fold: certainly we in the FDA see it this way and I would suspect that others in this audience do, also.

First, there is the responsibility for maintaining the health of the public, as I noted before. There is increased concern about the possibility of drug residues in edible meat, milk, eggs, poultry, and fish products. This concern has been expressed in a number of ways by veterinarians, by leaders in the drug and animal feed industries, by leaders in animal agriculture, as well as by Government officials. A great deal has been said, of course, about antibiotics. Back in 1963, the Expert Committee of the World Health Organization published in its report on antibiotics in food and feedstuffs this warning on the problem of sensitivity:

> "Individuals not previously sensitized might become so, or persons previously sensitized as a result, for example, of medical treatment with an antibiotic, might develop reactions of hypersensitivity."

The FDA's Advisory Committee was equally concerned in 1966 and asked that our agency, "give greater emphasis to its responsibilities for ascertaining and evaluating the long-term ecologic effects of the veterinary medical and nonmedical uses of antibiotics. "Criteria developed from such studies," the Committee said, "should be applied to the evaluation of new uses and the reevaluation of current uses and practices." It further recommended "continuous evaluation and surveillance of the safety and efficacy of these uses in terms of the public health."