ACCIDENT COMPENSATION

INTRODUCTION

There were two sessions at the 1985 AULSA Conference on Accident Compensation: a plenary session which took the form of a panel discussion and an interest group session. The chief speakers at the plenary session (Professors T.G. Ison, M. Chesterman and M.A. Neave) were each asked to identify a topic within the field of Accident Compensation that they considered of major concern on the assumption that a no-fault scheme (whether comprehensive or restricted to particular activities such as employment or transport) were to be implemented and which may have been given less emphasis in public discussion than it should. The topics chosen according to this criterion raised issues central to the purposes that a no-fault scheme might seek to fulfil (the problems and effects of etiological classifications in the definition of the limits of no-fault schemes, the principles on which compensation provisions might be structured and the ways in which rehabilitation may be treated seriously in the context of a no-fault scheme). The paper given at the Torts and Contract interest group by Professor C.S. Phegan ("From Compensation to Care: A Change of Direction for Accident Victims") raised similar issues. It then seemed desirable that the three principal commentaries to the plenary session and this paper should be published together.

The speakers at the panel session had not been asked to prepare papers, but their speeches were recorded and are published as they were given, subject to only mild stylistic editing. The session was chaired by John Keeler and (as will be apparent) Professor Harold Luntz of Melbourne spoke forcefully in support of the main themes of Professor Chesterman's address. A thematic link between papers in no way implies a correspondence of views between the chief participants; indeed, some of the fiercer discussion was between them.