would not make patients' notes ready, they would not call the patients or show them the way to the clinic and they would not make any appointments. When all these manoeuvres failed the attendance register 'disappeared' after three months of running the clinic. Needless to say, this attitude had a negative effect on the patients who felt despised for taking an overdose. Another difficulty I faced was inappropriate referrals by the psychiatric trainees. The clinic was overwhelmed by referrals of drinking problems, marital difficulties and social and housing problems. This problem was solved by allocating two induction sessions for the newcomers to psychiatry to explain the function of the clinic.

Role of the clinic

It helps patients to avoid the social stigma of being labelled as a psychiatric case. It reduces the workload on the psychiatric out-patients and shortens the waiting lists. It reduces human suffering, both physically and psychologically, on a personal level and within the family. It shows A & E staff that this group of patients is 'treatable' and not merely a bunch of inadequate, immature and attention-seeking psychopaths.

I feel that it helps if the senior registrar has had training in various psychotherapeutic skills like counselling, problem solving techniques or crisis intervention. On the other hand, the clinic should not be used by the trainees as an expedient to avoid making an on the spot decision since many of them will be faced with this responsibility sooner or later.

The clinic has been providing a useful service for A & E patients for the last three years in spite of the usual disruption in the service due to shortage of medical staff.

I found that setting up and running this clinic has given me insight into the power struggle within the NHS hospitals and made me aware of such forces when planning any future service.

MAHMOOD AL-BACHARI

Leighton Hospital
Leighton, near Crewe

References

GREER, S. & BAGLEY, C. (1971) Effect of psychiatric intervention in attempted suicide: A controlled study. *Brtish Medical Journal*, **i**, 310–312.

HAWTON, K. (1987) Attempted suicide. *Medicine International*, **43**, 1786–1790.

Assessment of drunk patients

DEAR SIRS

Further to contributions in the *Bulletin* (March and November 1988) from Dr Healy and Dr Connolly, I wish to challenge certain widespread assumptions concerning the assessment of inebriated patients. Policy, either implicit or possibly enshrined in some document, is generally to exclude patients who attend for assessment whilst drunk. Often in condescending terms, they are asked to remove themselves (or be removed) and are invited in an equally condescending fashion to re-present when sober.

This clearly is both economic and safe since so many alcohol dependent patients cannot summon the courage to seek help during intervals of sobriety. Alcoholics Anonymous recognises this problem and welcomes the moderately inebriated so long as their behaviour is tolerable. Similarly, so long as I do not consider that the patient's behaviour is unreasonable, I find it often valuable to conduct the interview in the state in which the patient has been able to present him/herself. (I do not permit smoking.)

Contrary to accepted wisdom, caring interventions by the clinician are generally remembered by the mildly inebriated patient, and these greatly increase the likelihood of reattendance when sober. The disinhibition afforded by alcohol may render an otherwise prickly patient capable of providing an honest account of every aspect of his life, not least a more accurate drinking history.

I do take a certain risk, and sensible precautions are vital: I do not wish to be assaulted, my consulting room smashed up, or have my carpet vomited upon. However, *In vino veritas*, and surely *veritas* is the *sine qua non* of any assessment.

JOHN STEVENS

St Francis Hospital
Haywards Heath, West Sussex

Psychiatrists' use of investigations

DEAR SIRS

I read with interest Dr Anthony White's paper on psychiatrist's use of investigations (*Psychiatric Bulletin*, October 1988, **12**, 430–433). Dr White's comments on his findings fail to mention some rather obvious possible explanations for the results and make some assumptions that should be challenged. There appears to be an assumption that fewer investigations equate with better practice, and that the practices followed by consultants are inevitably better than those of their junior colleagues. I would like to challenge those assumptions by proposing that the reason the number of investigations thought appropriate for a particular case reaches a peak at registrar level, and thereafter declines to consultant level, is that registrars have their heads crammed full of facts and figures in preparation for their examinations, and that this mass of knowledge eventually decays to consultant level. It is with the decay of this knowledge that the unusual or rare case stands out more