

Healthcare at the high court

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

Author(s) Los Angeles Times editorial board

Source Los Angeles Times

Date November 16, 2011

URL <http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinionla/la-ed-health-20111116,0,4240404.story>

Quote

“ Judge Laurence Silberman (a Reagan appointee) ruled that the individual mandate is constitutional because it regulates the way people pay for their inevitable participation in the market for medical care. In addition, he wrote, the mandate is a critical part of the new rules Congress created for the insurance industry, which are designed to expand coverage and stop insurers from discriminating against people with preexisting conditions. As the Supreme Court has previously decided, Congress can intervene in local, individual decisions when necessary to support a legitimate regulatory regime for interstate commerce. ”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position Act should not have been passed on the topic Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Retrieved from "https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Healthcare_at_the_high_court&oldid=15064"

This page was last edited on November 17, 2011, at 14:59.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.