

To the Public Petitions Committee – 11<sup>th</sup> April 2015:

PE1376

It is hard to believe I first tendered my petition to the PPC in November 2010 asking the Scottish Government to “ban the presence of METHANOL in all manufactured products in our diets” The primary source of methanol entering our bodies is an artificial sweetener but it is also used in injections and other medical procedures.

Methanol has been approved for use in our food by COT and the FSA since 1982; my petition suggested this decision was wrong and that chronic consumption of ANY amount of methanol by humans over time is highly dangerous and I could prove it. I requested that the veracity of my data and that of learned colleagues be considered by an independent panel. This has been studiously ignored.

I have responded to and answered all correspondence challenging my petition from whichever quarter it came; yet the PPC have procrastinated at every meeting either not passing it on to a sister committee (can't remember the name) recommended the data be considered independently, nor dismissing it. I can't help feeling badly let down.

The Committee is no doubt in possession of FSA's proud pronouncement, of the results of their fully funded Hull Pilot Study – if it wasn't for the tenacity of campaigners badgering the FSA to release the study results over the last 5 years, this study would have quietly slipped into FSA archives never to be seen again. Some things you will not read in the Peer reviewed article you will be considering;

1. Scheduled to last 18 months with a budget of £150,000 the study took nearly 6 years up to Peer review with a final budget of nearly £500,000! - who will be brought to account for this gross overspend and explain what benefits the taxpayer will derive from it.
2. The study was refused Peer review by credited publications first approached by FSA.
3. Over £300,000 was spent on very sophisticated testing (blinding us with science) how necessary was that?

The results were based on a very small number of aspartame sensitive volunteers (48) but 218 others refused to take part after initially enquiring – why were they afraid? Please read the Peer review conclusion; what does it actually say and what can be misconstrued from it.

I know I have an axe to grind here but was hoping I would be given a chance by the PPC to have my data independently scrutinised. Clearly I was challenging well established institutions (FSA, COT, EFSA etc) potentially for the health of the nation; No one should be consuming industrial Methanol in ANY quantity; each molecule of methanol can turn into a molecule of formaldehyde deep within our most sensitive organs; Heart & Brain even down to our DNA.

I rest my case.

Yours Sincerely

James McDonald      11<sup>th</sup> April 2015