

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

C.H./Malaria/14th Session  
P.V.3

HEALTH ORGANISATION.

MALARIA COMMISSION.

Fourteenth Session.

-----

Provisional Minutes

Third Meeting

Held on June 28th, 1928, at 4.30 p.m.

Chairman: Dr. LUTRARIO

Present: All members who attended the previous meeting.

Secretariat: Dr. RAJCHMAN, Director of the Health Section.

Report of the First Sub-Commission (C.H./Malaria/121).

Professor BRUMPT, Rapporteur, read the draft report (C.H./Malaria/121), and added that he proposed to leave it to the Secretariat to make certain typographical modifications.

Resolution 1.

Resolution 1 was adopted in the following form :

"Each Government should establish a central permanent organisation, either independent or attached to an institute, composed of several selected workers who would devote their whole time to malaria research and act as scientific advisers".

Resolution 2.

Professor OTTOLENGHI considered this resolution unnecessary. Most of the time it was impossible to employ all the means for combatting malaria. What it was essential to say was that in those cases where it was possible they would all be employed, and in the other cases they would only be partially employed. He proposed the following wording :

"The Commission is not in favour of utilising all available methods of control at the same time.....".

The CHAIRMAN held that this was a question of substance, and that it was essential to obviate the reopening of the discussion. Moreover the second sentence of the resolution explained its meaning.

Professor OTTOLENGHI did not wish to prolong the discussion, but thought it necessary to avoid giving the impression that the Commission did not advise the use of all methods on occasions when it was feasible to carry them out.

M. BENAMICO supported this declaration; the present wording might be calculated to cause serious difficulties, since in actual work all possible methods were employed.

Professor MARCHOUX insisted on the maintenance of the resolution in its present wording.

Professor MARCHOUX, Colonel JAMES and Professor SCHILLING proposed drafting modifications to the explanatory memorandum. These modifications were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the text submitted to the Commission, which was adopted by 18 votes to 6, in the following form :

"The Commission is not in favour of utilising all available methods of control in the same locality at the same time. They consider it preferable to employ only one or two methods which, with the means available, can be brought above the standard called 'minimum effective degree of perfection'".

Resolution 3.

Professor MARCHOUX proposed a drafting modification to the explanatory memorandum.

The modification was adopted.

Dr. RAJCHMAN pointed out that the resolution reproduced word for word paragraph 3 of item 4 in the agenda. The only change was the addition of the word "seul" at the beginning of the second sentence:

"Le seul fait", and the substitution of the word "région" for the word "pays".

Resolution 3 was adopted in the following form :

"Subject to certain defined limitation, there should be considerable freedom of choice as regards the particular methods of malaria control to be adopted. The Commission deprecates the use of measures in one country on the ground that they have been successful in another where, perhaps, circumstances and conditions are quite different".

Resolutions 4 and 5.

Professor MOGHT proposed a drafting amendment to the explanatory memorandum. The amendment was adopted.

Resolutions 4 and 5 were adopted in the following form :

- (4) "Number 4 of the Agenda was transferred to the Agenda for the Third Sub-Commission".
- (5) "Whatever other means may be employed in malarial localities, the Commission considers that it is essential in the first place to treat the sick".

Resolution 6.

Professor MARCHOUX proposed a drafting amendment to the explanatory memorandum. The amendment was adopted.

Resolution 6 was adopted in the following form :

"The good result of early diagnosis and efficient treatment are more apparent in the reduction of the severity of the disease than in the reduction of its incidence".

Resolution 7.

Professor MARCHOUX thought that the explanatory memorandum was not quite clear and required modification.

Dr. RAJCHMAN suggested that the English text of the explanatory memorandum should be adopted and then be translated into French.

Colonel JAMES, Dr. KLIGLER and Dr. HACKETT proposed certain drafting amendments to the explanatory memorandum. The amendments were adopted.

Resolution 7 was adopted in the following form :

"The execution of the measures must reach a somewhat high degree of efficiency ('minimum effective degree of perfection') before its effect on incidence would become appreciable".

Resolution 8.

Professor OTTOLENGHI pointed out that the explanatory memorandum had no direct bearing on the conclusion. It mentioned too many subjects and introduced in a haphazard manner the term "bonification", which in the first report had emerged as the result of a general discussion on the character and importance of these measures of intensive cultivation. Accordingly, the explanatory memorandum should be divided into two parts, the second of which would deal only with "bonification".

M. BONAMICO pointed out that the position was still more complicated in the English text, where the word "bonification" did not appear at all.

Dr. MAXCY agreed.

Dr. RAJCHMAN said that if the Chairman of the First Sub-Commission so desired it would be possible to postpone approving Article 8, and to submit a new text at the next meeting.

Colonel JAMES thought that the resolution should be divided into two parts.

Dr. RAJCHMAN thought that it should be arranged in two paragraphs under the same heading. The word "moreover" would be deleted in the second paragraph, which would begin as follows :

"It is certain that the use of antilarval measures.....".

Professor MARCHOUX was quite clear that the resolution should form a single whole; it explained that in the course of the major essential works, and until such time as these had proved their efficacy, the minor works might be undertaken.

Professor BRUMPT proposed that the text should be left as it was, and that its meaning should be explained by developing the explanatory memorandum.

The explanatory memorandum was to be remodelled and developed.

Resolution 8 was adopted in the following form :

"The improvement of the conditions of the inhabitants which result from the development of widespread 'bonification' is one of the determining factors in the regression of malaria. The work done is only efficacious in so far as it produces intensive cultivation of the ground. It is certain, moreover, that the use of antilarval measures whilst more extensive works are being carried out is of great value inasmuch as it reduces the anopheline density and serves to bridge the dangerous period which accompanies and follows such undertakings".

#### Resolution 9.

Professor MARCHOUX did not remember the discussion of this text.

Dr. HACKETT said that he also did not remember this discussion. He pointed out a misprint in the second paragraph which should be drafted in the following terms: "These methods are as follows : intensive treatment of the patients.....".

Professor BRUMPT recalled that there had been a special discussion on this text at the end of a meeting at which all those particularly concerned had been present.

Dr. RAJCHMAN said that this text was the result of a discussion that had taken place at the end of the last meeting of the first Sub-Committee. It had been adopted at the meeting on the afternoon of June 26th and this adoption had been a sign of the final and definite agreement of the first Sub-Committee. It would be dangerous to reopen the discussion.

Professor MISSIROLI laid great stress on the extreme importance of this text; it was essential to reflect upon it and to open a discussion on the question of substance. All the members of the Commission were directly concerned with this Resolution, which, in the first Sub-Committee, had only been discussed confidentially and in private among a small group of persons.

Dr. RAJCHMAN recalled that the Commission was free to resume the discussion, but he appealed to the memory of the members of the first Sub-Committee who might bear witness that this text had been approved in due form.

Professor PITTALUGA pointed out that the Commission was confronted by a problem of procedure; was it to discuss a second time a text which had already been discussed and on which a vote in due form had been taken? The Commission was also confronted by a problem which touched on the substance of the question. Would it not be expedient to await at leisure the opinion of so competent and understanding a member as Professor Missiroli? Therefore, while considering that this text had indeed been adopted in due form, it was proper and desirable that Professor Missiroli should be invited to state the alterations that he would wish to have made in it.

Colonel JAMES said that he was one of the members of the Sub-Committee who had voted against this text. He proposed that some of the members of the Commission and Professor Missiroli should discuss it with a view to drawing up a text which would be presented at the next meeting. It was essential to reach agreement and not to force anyone's hand.

Professor MISSIROLI accepted this procedure.

The CHAIRMAN said that although it had been understood that the discussion on the question of substance would not be re-opened, it would be expedient in the present position that it should be re-opened, for it was essential that the adoption of this text should not be based on any misunderstanding.

Professor MARCHOUK made a request that he might take part in this conversation.

Dr. RAJCHMAN noted that it had just been proposed that the discussion should be re-opened. A choice had to be made between two courses: either a discussion was desired and in these circumstances the general discussion was open to the Commission, or it was not desired. In the latter case a vote should be immediately proceeded to. He did not understand why this question should be adjourned.

Professor BRUEPT warmly supported this statement; five or six persons had been accused of having undertaken on their own a piece of work that had not been presented to the Sub-Committee as a whole; this was not the moment to adopt the precise procedure against which a protest had just been made.

Professor MISSIROLI pointed out that the Medical Director had been able to prepare his agenda calmly with plenty of time at his disposal; he requested in his turn a calm and private discussion.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that Professor Marchoux, Professor Missiroli and Colonel James should withdraw for a few moments for the preparation of a text in order that this conclusion might be adopted in the course of the meeting.

This proposal was adopted.

Professor MARCHEUX pointed out that Resolution 9 seemed to offer a choice between the various methods of combating malaria; there was, however, no such choice.

Professor BRUMPT recalled that nevertheless, land improvement (bonification) was of very great importance but that there were districts in which it could not be undertaken, some mountain pastures for instance.

Professor OTTOLENGHI thought that if the various measures were to be enumerated in the order of their importance, the treatment should be given the first place, then the anti-larvae measures and then land improvement. There was no absolute general rule.

M. BONAMICO said that one of his English colleagues had informed him that the word "bonification" (land improvement) had no meaning for him. The English text of the resolution should therefore be altered. Moreover in the French text there was ground for explaining the term "bonification intégrale". It might be pointed out that the ground was to be placed under intensive culture.

Dr. EVANS recalled that land improvement comprised a whole group of measures and demanded definition.

Professor OTTOLENGHI recalled that this term had been discussed on many occasions; it had been noted that in other languages than Italian there did not exist a term indicating all the measures comprised in the word "bonificazioni". For this reason a long definition had been given on p. 84 of the report and resort might be had to this, although it would very seldom be necessary, for this term had become an international one.

M. BONAMICO said that he would be satisfied with the term "bonification intégrale" for the English text.

Colonel JAMES resumed his place in order to inform the Sub-Committee of his conversation with Professor Missiroli. He well recalled that in the course of the discussion of the first Sub-Committee it had been wondered whether it was expedient to insert the second paragraph of this resolution, which was of an entirely subsidiary character, and which in some respects was in contradiction with the statement of the grounds for Resolution 7. He proposed, therefore, that the second paragraph should merely be suppressed.

Professor MARCHOUX, Professor MISSIROLI and Dr. HACKETT supported this proposal.

The CHAIRMAN proposed that this suppression should be put to the vote.

Professor PITRALUGA thought that these three lines might certainly be suppressed if it were only a matter of reaching a parliamentary compromise. But this Assembly was composed

of men of science who wished to place their opinion clearly on record and it would not be right to prevent them from expressing it. What had been the object of the paragraph that it was sought to suppress, in the minds of those who had drafted it and of those who had accepted it in the first Sub-Committee? It was a question, after undertaking detailed examination of the different principles, of summarising order of importance the successive measures to be taken; in the first place the treatment, then the anti-larvaë measures, then the anti-anopheles measures, then finally integral land improvements. Those who did not accept this text should say so and should justify their views; it would then be seen whether it should be more clearly drafted or whether it should be suppressed.

Professor MARCHOUX thought that the object of the authors of this text had been merely to summarise the different measures; it seemed from the present text that different measures were recommended in a fixed order.

Colonel JAMES quite agreed with Professor Pittaluga, but when it was sought to judge what the authors of this text might have had in mind, it appeared that it might be replied that they had had no purely fixed object and that they had merely enumerated the measures against malaria in order to adorn the text, and to offer an index to the malariologists, in the case of one of them forgetting the existence of one or other of these measures. He proposed that the enumeration should be suppressed.

Dr. RAJCHMAN recalled that the Code Napoléon did not permit investigation as to paternity; he hoped that this code was not in force in Geneva, and that consequently it would

be possible to seek who was responsible for this text. Now in actual fact, although the Secretariat confined its activities to obstetrical operations, it should be openly admitted that it was Dr. Rajchman who was the only father of this text, and that it was precisely those who had wished to alter it who had been the obstetricians. He was therefore entitled to state that he was in complete disagreement with Colonel James and that there was no question in this enumeration of stylistic effect. The present difference of opinion was due to the fact that in the Malaria world various tendencies had shown themselves, and that the Health Committee had wished to escape from this difficult position by making clear the points on which there was agreement, those that remained obscure and those that demanded further investigation. The discussions of June 25th and 26th had been specially interesting in this respect and had been the starting-point of a new epoch in the combating of malaria. The two protagonists in two opposed theses, Colonel James and Dr. Hackett, had been heard with much interest. When Dr. Hackett had concluded his statement which had been approved by Colonel James, Dr. Rajchman had made this quite simple and natural proposal that for the relevant chapter of the Second General Report there should be substituted Dr. Hackett's statement. At the following meeting, having received the English verbatim report of this statement, he had taken a resolution from it which, he thought, summarised it completely. He had shown this text of the resolution to Dr. Hackett, who had accepted it. He had afterwards shown it to Colonel James, who had also given it his support, with the exception of the second paragraph. He had then asked the other members of the first Sub-Committee whether this text might obtain the majority of votes. Why had this second paragraph, enumerating the various methods, been introduced? It had been because the

~~differences of~~ opinion related to these methods: on the one hand were the ardent partisans of the anti-larval measures, on the other hand, those who recognised the value of these measures but thought that the particular conditions of certain districts did not lend themselves to them. Therefore, if this resolution were adopted an extremely important agreement would be completely and finally realised, and there might be set up, against the multiplicity of the divergent interpretations, the acquired approval of these methods.

He recalled that at the meeting of June 25th there had been a very warm discussion as to whether quinine was or was not a preventive measure. Similarly, after the journey in Palestine there had been a discussion on the real value of anti-larval measures. Similarly, the relative value of Professor Missiroli's work had been warmly discussed.

He had thought therefore that by assembling all these methods on an equal footing in the same paragraph an end would be put to this continual discussion.

Professor PITTAUGA said that he was very pleased that Colonel James and the Medical Director had explained the meaning of this second paragraph. From what Colonel James had said it was obvious that the object of this text was not to suggest a succession of measures. From what Dr. Rajchman had said it was obvious that it had not been intended to enumerate them in order of importance. It was a case therefore of enumerating the different methods that might be employed. Since there was no statement that any one method was superior, he ventured to beg Professor Missiroli to give his support.

Colonel JAMES pointed out that the importance of this paragraph had steadily diminished and that it had now reached a point at which it was devoid of meaning. It was no longer anything more than a mere enumeration intended to prevent malariologists from forgetting any one of the possible measures. Consequently, since this paragraph now only contained redundancy, which, moreover, was in contradiction with the statement of the ground for Article 7, it would be best to suppress it.

Professor BRUMPT thought that the second paragraph might point out that, while the methods were enumerated in this order, it was in no way intended to give particular importance to any one of them.

Professor SWEILENGREBEL recalled that in the statement of the grounds for Article 7 it had been pointed out that "if the Commission had not wished carefully to avoid mixing general principles with recommendations of special application, it would have been possible to advise the adoption of the various methods consecutively and thus to try first treatment, then anti-larval measures and later "bonification". Now this consecutive adoption of the methods was precisely what the second paragraph advised.

The CHAIRMAN put the suppression of the second paragraph to the vote.

Ten members voted in favour of its suppression.

The CHAIRMAN put the preservation of the second paragraph to the vote.

Ten members voted in favour of its preservation.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that there was not complete certainty as to the enumeration of votes and proposed that a second vote should be resorted to.

Colonel JAMES said that he would abstain from voting and withdrew.

Professor MIREIROLI also withdrew.

Professor KLIGLER thought that in the case of such a difference of opinion, it would be expedient to refer the whole question to a Sub-Committee which should be directed to draw up a text that might be unanimously accepted.

Professor PITTALUGA associated himself with this proposal. It was indeed impossible to decide by means of a vote views expressed in the name of science. He expressed his surprise, moreover, at the extreme attitudes that had been made evident in connection with a point of such slight importance. Each of the members of the Committee should return to his own country with his own opinion, but also with the great pleasure of having heard the opinions of the other members. This had been the spirit in which the Health Committee had convened this meeting. No more could be asked of people who had dedicated their lives to so far-reaching a work.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the Commission showed its entire approval of Professor Pittaluga's intervention.

Colonel JAMES resumed his place.

Dr. RAJCHMAN thought that there was general agreement that the discussion should not be prolonged. He proposed therefore that the Chairman, together with the three Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the Sub-Committees, should be included in the Sub-Committee proposed by Professor Kligler.

This proposal was adopted.

The meeting rose at 7.30 p.m.