

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910450949203321
Autore	Syrett Keith
Titolo	Law, legitimacy, and the rationing of healthcare : a contextual and comparative perspective // Keith Syrett [[electronic resource]]
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Cambridge : , : Cambridge University Press, , 2007
ISBN	1-107-17723-5 1-281-24334-5 9786611243340 0-511-37791-6 0-511-49538-2 0-511-37700-2 0-511-37606-5 0-511-37456-9 0-511-37880-7
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (xiii, 252 pages) : digital, PDF file(s)
Collana	Cambridge law, medicine, and ethics ; ; 6
Disciplina	344.041
Soggetti	Health care rationing - Law and legislation Health care rationing - Government policy Health care rationing - Moral and ethical aspects
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Title from publisher's bibliographic system (viewed on 05 Oct 2015).
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and index.
Nota di contenuto	Why 'ration' healthcare resources? -- How rationing takes place? -- Rationing and the problem of legitimacy -- Rationing and the courts: theoretical perspectives -- Rationing in the courts: England -- Rationing in the courts: Canada -- Rationing in the courts: South Africa.
Sommario/riassunto	Dr Keith Syrett argues for a reappraisal of the role of public law adjudication in questions of healthcare rationing. As governments worldwide turn to explicit rationing strategies to manage the mismatch between demand for and supply of health services and treatments, disappointed patients and the public have sought to contest the moral authority of bodies making rationing decisions. This has led to the growing involvement of law in this field of public policy. The author

argues that, rather than bemoaning this development, those working within the health policy community should recognise the points of confluence between the principles and purposes of public law and the proposals which have been made to address rationing's 'legitimacy problem'. Drawing upon jurisprudence from England, Canada and South Africa, the book evaluates the capacity of courts to establish the conditions for a process of public deliberation from which legitimacy for healthcare rationing may be derived.
