

Health Advisory Service

DEAR SIRs

I would like to support the call for the abolition of the HAS made by Dr Crow and his colleagues from Northwick Park (*Bulletin*, June 1986, 10, 150–151). The original Hospital Advisory Service was established in 1969 following several public enquiries which exposed serious shortcomings in the long-term care provided to the mentally ill and mentally handicapped in some hospitals. It was a sensitive and tactful political move intended to improve standards and reduce the chance of further scandals and enquiries. By and large, it has been notably successful in this regard.

In recent years, however, the service, renamed the Health Advisory Service, appears to have concentrated on promoting one particular model of psychiatry and psychiatric services, support for which may be widespread, but certainly not unanimous. Dr Horrocks denies that there is an HAS 'party line' (*Bulletin*, June 1986, 10, 145–146) but there certainly is consistency in HAS reports, such as the promotion of the concept of Mental Health Resource Centres and an associated run-down of hospital services.

Whilst there may not be a declared overall HAS policy, it is inevitable that the general approach will reflect the Director's own perception of psychiatric services from the perspective of a former Consultant in Geriatric Medicine; his particular concept would naturally influence his choice of team members, who would be unlikely to be persons taking a radically different view to his own. Moreover, the HAS is funded by the allocation of central department resources and the Service is unlikely, therefore, to feel able to other than foster Government and central department policies on the basis of 'who pays the piper . . .'. This was certainly my experience in relation to a recent visit, where it seemed that team members were quite unable or unwilling to confront a number of unsatisfactory issues surrounding the implementation of the Griffiths Report. I was also left with the clear impression of the HAS team members promoting a theoretical model of psychiatric services, possibly appropriate to a district such as Kidderminster, where 90% of the 100,000 population live within four miles of the hospital but was less relevant in Powys, with a similar population but no District General Hospital and the population scattered over 2000 square miles with two of its population centres over 100 miles apart.

The perjorative use of the word 'institution' to describe a psychiatric hospital service in such a situation revealed the team members' prejudices and preconceptions rather than an open-minded analysis of our services.

After 17 years the original HAS has done its work and perhaps has now run out of steam, and, rather like the Draft Code of the Mental Health Act Commission, is trying to proselytise a particular view of psychiatric illness, its treatment and management.

Dr Horrocks invites those who call for the abolition of the HAS 'to speculate on the potential acceptability of the replacement inspectorate which would undoubtedly be

imposed instead'. However, the Education service and Social Services are both subject to an inspectorate answerable to a central government department, and in general this appears to be satisfactory and acceptable. In the post-Griffiths era, with increasing autonomy being given to district management, it would now seem appropriate for there to be a central department inspectorate which defines agreed standards of care and performance and evaluates district services against these criteria. Such an inspectorate would be a welcome safeguard against the wilder excesses of 'Griffiths's' management.

MICHAEL A. HESSION

*Mid Wales Hospital
Talgarth, Brecon*

DEAR SIRs

I have noted with considerable interest the vigorous correspondence in the *Bulletin* regarding the role and usefulness of the HAS, especially as we have been the subject of a visit by the Advisory Service under the personal direction of Dr Horrocks within the last month. The correspondence is of considerable interest to myself as I was trained as both an undergraduate and a postgraduate by one of the Academic Departments (Manchester) which has recently been complaining so vociferously about the Advisory Service's comments regarding the role and effectiveness of local psychiatric services in South Manchester.

I have to say that my own view was that the Advisory Service Panel very rapidly appeared to have come to a remarkably shrewd and insightful view of the structure and shortcomings of services in the Bury Health Authority area to which we currently contribute.

It seemed to me that Dr Horrocks and his team had identified very clearly, not merely the local difficulties, but also the interaction and interplay of various personalities responsible for the development and management of services, which I have observed myself whilst working as a clinician in the area for nearly two years.

Perhaps academic departments of psychiatry require to be reminded that the Advisory Service's main interest is the development of truly locally based patient/client oriented services and I suspect that the Advisory Service assumes that centres of academic excellence are undertaking excellent research without the need to comment on it directly.

Our own Health Authority, Salford, was itself the subject of an Advisory Service visit only two years ago and, yet again, I have to state that the Service appeared to have a very clear and well thought through view of our own problems at that time and it seems to be that the interdisciplinary nature of the panel is of singular advantage when it is necessary to comment on shortfalls in service provision by a variety of agencies and disciplines, not all of which are by any means the expert province of clinical psychiatrists.