

# Britain's Medicine Regulatory Agency (MHRA) Receives Funding from Gates Foundation

By [Cassie B.](#)

Global Research, August 23, 2021

[BigPharmaNews.com](#) 19 August 2021

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the "Translate Website" drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg\\_globalresearch](#).

\*\*\*

*The UK's Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency, or MHRA, is meant to be a neutral body that is responsible for making sure that the medicine and medical devices used in the country are acceptably safe.*

However, there are serious questions about the agency's impartiality because they [receive significant funding](#) from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation in what can only be considered a major conflict of interest. The foundation holds major shares in COVID-19 vaccine developers Pfizer and BioNTech.

Perhaps this explains why the Pfizer and BioNTech vaccine was the first one to be authorized for use in children aged 12 and over back in June and remained the only one available to this age group until Moderna's vaccine was approved this week.

The approval of Pfizer's vaccine was particularly shocking when you consider that 86 percent of children who participated in the very short and small clinical study used to make the decision suffered from an adverse reaction.

In a Freedom of Information request [posted on the website of the MHRA](#), a representative of the agency admitted that they do receive funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation that mainly supports work on strengthening the regulatory systems in other countries. They added that most of their income comes from fees paid by the pharmaceutical industry.

# Freedom of Information request on whether the MHRA receives funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (FOI 21-624)

Published 13 August 2021

21st June 2021 FOI 21/624

Dear

Thank you for your email.

We do receive funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation as well as other sources outside government such as WHO. This funding mainly supports work to strengthen regulatory systems in other countries.

The agency stated that the current level of grant funding that they receive from the foundation is roughly \$3 million, which they say is spread across several projects and three to four financial years.

They added that they would not approve any COVID-19 vaccines until they demonstrate “safety, quality and efficacy through a robust clinical trial programme, as determined by the MHRA, and unless the evidence supports its use.” However, they go on to add that they carefully reviewed the clinical trial data for Pfizer’s vaccine in a study of just 2000 children. They said that the safety data in children was on par with that seen in young adults, which is hardly comforting.

They added that the immunogenicity results, which show how well a vaccine functions, showed that children aged 12 to 15 had similar neutralizing antibody levels to those aged 16 to 25, but they only studied 200 children to reach this conclusion.

Why would any legitimate government agency want to be associated with the Bill & Melinda Gates foundation?

In 2017, the MHRA announced a partnership worth more than £980,000 with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the World Health Organization aimed at improving safety monitoring of medicine in low and middle-income countries. Two years later, they [announced a partnership](#) with the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation to research “medicine use which could impact the health of pregnant women around the world.”

This is deeply troubling to anyone who is familiar with the Gates’ track record. Bill himself has gone on the record in a TED conference as saying that vaccines, healthcare and reproductive services could be used to reduce the world’s population. The foundation has also been accused of giving vaccines with sterilization chemicals to unsuspecting Africans.

India’s National Technical Advisory Group on Immunization even went so far as to [cut ties](#)

[with the foundation](#) after it was revealed that its vaccine “campaigns” being conducted on young Indian girls on the pretense of protecting them from cervical cancer were really a form of cloaked vaccine trials that used two highly controversial HPV vaccines linked to significant injury and death.

It’s hard to believe that medical regulators in any country would want any association with them, but the MHRA has been troubled for many years. In 2005, the agency came under fire from the UK’s House of Commons Health Committee for a lack of transparency, and they were accused of [advancing the interests of pharmaceutical companies](#) instead of the interests of the people by the same committee the year before.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg\_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

*Featured image is from BigPharmaNews.com*

The original source of this article is [BigPharmaNews.com](#)  
Copyright © [Cassie B.](#), [BigPharmaNews.com](#), 2021

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Cassie B.](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)