Attention Public Health Committee Members:

As a taxpayer in CT, I am asking that you vote no on HB 5044

There are better ways to handle vaccine policy than the mandatory use of a specific MMR vaccine, sold by one company, Merck, a monopoly.
Let's look at the Japanese model. In 1989, the Japanese government made the MMR vaccine mandatory, but they experienced a large number of serious adverse reactions, and in 1993 banned MMR. Instead, they adopted individual vaccines for measles and rubella, and excluded mumps. Further, they made them optional and recommended not giving them at the same time.

This Japanese caution about vaccines has continued. In 2013, Japan suspended the Merck Gardasil vaccine due to many adverse reactions in young women. Meanwhile, they have combined Measles and Rubella into a single vaccination, but still have kept Mumps separate. Many vaccines are optional in Japan. Their concern for child safety is paramount.

What has been the result of such a policy? Since 2015, Japan, a nation of 126 million people, has experienced annual numbers of measles cases ranging from 35 to several hundred. There has not been a catastrophic pandemic in spite of maintaining a voluntary system, while carefully monitoring adverse reactions. And Japan still has one of the lowest rates of infant mortality in the world, far lower than the US with its more aggressive vaccine schedule.

Why not adopt a policy similar to Japan's in which the vaccines could be given separately and not at the same time, to reduce the simultaneous assault on a young child's immune system? This gives concerned parents an option to the single and controversial MMR vaccine.

Hiroko Mori, former head of the Infectious Disease Division at Japan's National Institute of Public Health, stated: "There are so many people who have suffered side effects. All we are asking is to establish the right to say 'no.' The right to choose should be recognized as a fundamental human right.

Thank you,

Thomas Sholly
Lebanon, CT 06249