

## **The Northern Territory Emergency Response and cannabis use in remote Indigenous communities.**

**Dennis Gray  
National Drug Research Institute  
Curtin University**

The Australian and international evidence clearly demonstrates that controls over availability are among the most effective means of reducing alcohol-related harm.<sup>1</sup> In recognition of this, additional restrictions on availability have been introduced as part of both the Commonwealth Government's Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER) and the Northern Territory Government's Alcohol Management Plans.<sup>2</sup> However, it has been widely asserted in public debate – particularly by those opposed to them – that these restrictions have had the unintended consequence of diverting people in remote communities from alcohol to cannabis consumption and that as a consequence there is an epidemic of cannabis use in such communities.<sup>3</sup>

Generally, the international evidence is limited but indicates that the substitution of one drug for another is variable and complex, and not a simple one-to-one phenomenon.<sup>4</sup> More specifically, there is a paucity of empirical data which could directly verify the assertion that cannabis has been substituted for alcohol as a consequence of the additional alcohol restrictions in the NT. However, while there may well have been some substitution, the increase in cannabis consumption was occurring *prior* to those restrictions. Such an increase was reported by Clough *et al.* in Arnhem Land in 2004 and by Putt and Delahunty in 2006.<sup>5,6</sup> Furthermore, Putt and Delahunty reported such an increase in Queensland, WA and SA – jurisdictions that were not later subject to the NT restrictions.

Thus, while there *may* have been some substitution of cannabis for alcohol following introduction of the NTER restrictions and Alcohol Management Plans, it seems clear that the increase in use *cannot* be attributed primarily to these interventions. Furthermore, regardless of the cause, the problem needs to be addressed, but it will not be addressed simply by relaxing alcohol restrictions.

### References

1. National Drug Research Institute (Contributors Chikritzhs TN, Gray D, Lyons Z, Siggers S). *Restrictions on the Sale and Supply of Alcohol: Evidence and Outcomes*. National Drug Research Institute. Curtin University of Technology, Perth, Western Australia, 2007.
2. Office of Indigenous Policy Coordination. *Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER) Monitoring Report: Measuring Progress of NTER Activities July 2008 to December 2008, Part One*. Canberra: Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, 2009.
3. 'Rising cannabis use linked to grog bans.' ABC News, Tuesday November 3, 2009. <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2009/11/03/2731642.htm> cited March 4, 2010.

4. Saffer H, Chaloupka FJ. Demographic differentials in the demand for alcohol and illicit drugs. In Chaloupka FJ, Grossman M, Bickel WK, Saffer H. *The Economic Analysis of Substance Use and Abuse: An Integration of Econometric and Behavioral Economic Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999: Ch 7: 187–212.
5. Clough A, d'Abbs P, Cairney S, Gray D, Maruff P, Parker R, O'Reilly B. Emerging patterns of cannabis and other substance use in Aboriginal communities in Arnhem Land, Northern Territory: a study of two communities. *Drug and Alcohol Review* 2004; 23 (4) (December): 381–390.
6. Putt J, Delahunty B. Illicit drug use in rural and remote Indigenous communities. *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice* No. 322. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology, 2006.