

Correspondence

Psychiatry of mental handicap services

DEAR SIRs

Recently there has emerged a school of thought which is finding favour in some Health Districts. Arguments which at first sound plausible are advanced to justify the virtual elimination of any National Health Service provision for mental handicap in a Health District. A corollary of this approach is that there is no need for a specialist consultant in mental handicap. As it may appear to save money, this trend has obvious attractions.

For many years it has been claimed by mental health pressure groups, and a large number of psychiatrists have supported the contention, that most of the patients in the older long-stay hospitals for mental handicap should not be there because they do not need the 'medical model' of continuing psychiatric nursing care. It is claimed that these people can be given a more normal life within a 'social model' of small groups living in ordinary houses in the community, with appropriate support.

The proponents of this 'normalization' viewpoint also argue that if mentally handicapped people have any behavioural or psychiatric disorders they should go to the 'generic' general psychiatric services. Often these general services are overstretched already and they can argue reasonably that if they are to take over a responsibility for mental handicap they should have the resources for it transferred to them.

Among mentally handicapped children and adults there is a small minority who present very serious management problems, particularly aggressive and violent conduct, or self-injury, which amount to the 'abnormally aggressive and seriously irresponsible conduct' referred to in the categories of 'mental impairment' and 'severe mental impairment' in the Mental Health Act 1983.

In practice mentally handicapped people with behaviour and psychiatric disorders are often not suitably placed in acute psychiatric units and mental illness hospitals. The occupational and training needs of mentally handicapped patients differ from those of psychiatric patients with normal intelligence.

Community-orientated, district-based services are the objectives to be achieved in the NHS strategy for mental handicap. Progress has been made across the country in appointing community nurses and establishing community mental handicap teams. These new services emphasize rather than diminish the need for specialist psychiatric back-up support with a residential NHS component as an essential to maintain the community services.

Mentally handicapped people who present seriously disturbed behaviour are not acceptable in community hostels and houses, they need a hospital type of facility for emergency admissions, observation, assessment and treatment. Like child psychiatry and the psychiatry of the elderly, the psychiatry of mental handicap concerns itself with a small minority of a distinct group within the popu-

lation who need psychiatric help and who have special needs which the general services for the majority do not satisfy.

Divisions of psychiatry need to be vigilant in holding and developing psychiatry of mental handicap services in their Districts to complement the community provision lest these services are sacrificed on the altar of over-idealistic philosophies.

D. A. SPENCER

*Meanwood Park Hospital
Leeds*

Mental Handicap and the Mental Health Act

DEAR SIRs

One of the anomalies of the 1983 Mental Health Act is the striking similarity of definition of 'severe mental impairment'; 'mental impairment'; and 'psychopathic disorder'. All the three definitions refer to 'abnormally aggressive or seriously irresponsible conduct' and the psychopathic disorder can also include 'significant impairment of intelligence'.

The intention of the legislation seems to be to protect the rights of mentally handicapped people but, inadvertently, some of the most vulnerable mentally handicapped people appear to be more at risk through the implementation of one particular aspect of the Act, that is Section 7 which authorizes the Local Authority Social Services Department to apply for Guardianship. These mentally handicapped members of 'families at risk', especially during crisis situations, may become the focus of abuse, particularly physical and sexual, from one or more members of the family. Such families need help and support but, more important and of immediate concern, is the removal and protection of the mentally handicapped individual from such a situation. The inclusion of behavioural criteria in the Act has increased this potential risk of abuse to mentally handicapped people who do not fulfil these criteria.

A questionnaire survey was carried out of the opinions of consultant psychiatrists in mental handicap about the definition of 'mental impairment' and 'severe mental impairment'; the preference of appropriate terminology; the inclusion of behavioural criteria; and the effects of the present definition as well as the changes they might wish to see in the 1983 Mental Health Act.

About 66 per cent of the 86 consultants approached (37.4 per cent response rate) did not consider 'mental impairment' and 'severe mental impairment' as defined by the Act to be appropriate and 63 per cent would prefer the term 'mental handicap' and 'severe mental handicap' as an alternative. About 42 per cent of respondents wanted to see the inclusion of 'abnormally aggressive or seriously irresponsible conduct' as part of the definition, and about 40 per cent thought otherwise. Eighteen per cent did not know or comment.

In response to the question of whether the inclusion of behavioural criteria in the definition of 'mental impairment/severe mental impairment' protected the mentally handicapped, 23 per cent replied 'yes' and 58 per cent, 'no'; 19 per cent were non-committal. When asked about wishes for the changes in the definitions, 51 consultants gave individual responses. Fifty-three per cent suggested the inclusion of a clause along the lines 'protection against exploitation of mentally handicapped person and protection against danger to self' in a modified definition. Twenty-one per cent did not wish any change; 14 per cent preferred removal of behavioural criteria from the definition; about four respondents wanted mild or borderline cases of mental handicap taken out of mental handicap legislation. Others wanted 'mental handicap' to be taken out of mental health legislation, redefining the categories according to need for treatment, rehabilitation, social reasons, etc.

The survey has focused on the controversial definition and criteria affecting some of the mentally handicapped people. Hopefully, in the near future, some of these serious weaknesses in an otherwise very humane, progressive and popular piece of mental health legislation, will be rectified, perhaps by emulating the 1983 Amendments of the Scottish Mental Health Act, with particular reference to 'mental handicap' and 'mental impairment'.

T. HARI SINGH

*Hensol Hospital
Pontyclun, Mid-Glamorgan*

Repatriation of mentally handicapped people

DEAR SIR

I felt that our experiences might be of interest to other readers.

Gloucestershire, which historically has had no long-stay mental handicap facilities within the county, has gradually been building up community services and units. We still have 200 persons with origins in the county who are placed in the Bristol mental handicap hospitals.

Two hundred next-of-kin of these people were circulated with a letter asking their opinions on repatriation, if we were to provide a small community unit in their locality. Of the 200 letters sent out, replies were only received from 47 (23.5 per cent). Of the 47 that replied, 19 were interested in repatriation; 23 expressed a desire for their relatives to remain in the same place, and not to be repatriated; and five expressed interest in visiting existing units, but tended to indicate a somewhat negative response.

The exercise shows the lack of concern of many of the next-of-kin of mentally handicapped people in hospital. It is also of interest that only 19 out of 200 were immediately positive about repatriation. This may reflect our previous policy of using the first 120 beds which we provided in small community units for repatriating people who had relatives that had maintained a good contact.

DAVID N. WILSON

*Coney Hill Hospital
Coney Hill, Gloucester*

Clomipramine Challenge Test

DEAR SIR

Clomipramine has been demonstrated over the years as an effective antidepressant with a particular predilection for the treatment of phobic and obsessional disorders. The results of numerous clinical trials have been extensively documented and references would be gladly supplied.

To use an efficient drug for purposes other than those for which it was originally intended may sometimes produce surprising results.

In the so-called 'diagnostic test' referred to by Dr Holmshaw (*Bulletin*, April 1984, 8, 76), i.e. to prove a diagnosis which should have been made by efficient history taking in any case and by a method which produces acutely adverse alternative symptoms, is naive, if not bizarre, and cannot be justified in any circumstances.

D. WAXMAN

*17 Upper Wimpole Street
London W1*

Saskatchewan's Secure Unit

DEAR SIR

In response to Dr M. Livingston's description of the Regional Psychiatric Centre (Prairies) (*Bulletin*, August 1984, 8, 155-56), I would like to add a few points of clarification and comparison. The three Regional Psychiatric Centres, serving respectively the Pacific, Prairies and Ontario Regions of Canada, offer the highest degree of security available in Canada for the treatment of mentally disordered offenders, and in this respect are comparable to the English Special Hospitals. All the Centres operate as institutions within the Correctional Service of Canada and are classified as maximum security penitentiaries, as well as psychiatric treatment facilities. 'The total separation of security and therapeutic roles', indicated in Dr Livingston's article, evolves directly from the penitentiary background of our institutions, in that orthodox Correctional Officers maintain perimeter and internal security, leaving primary patient care and management to be provided by our nursing and clinical staff.

Unlike the English Special Hospitals, where nursing staff often appear to suffer from a marked intrapersonal conflict of roles, between being a guard on the one hand and a therapist on the other, nursing staff at our Centres are able to view themselves clearly as primarily therapists. The advantages of this demarcation of respective roles are, however, sometimes offset by interdisciplinary rivalry between therapeutic and security staff, stemming from their differing philosophies and background.

The balance between therapeutic and security considerations is both an important and problematic area in the management of mentally disordered offenders, to which Canada has adopted a significantly different approach than that of the United Kingdom.

C. M. GREEN

*Regional Psychiatric Centre (Prairies)
Saskatoon, Canada*