



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

**PREPARED STATEMENT(1)
OF
PHILLIP L. BROYLES
DIRECTOR, CLEVELAND REGIONAL OFFICE
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**

**BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE
OF THE
MICHIGAN STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

March 28, 1995

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am pleased to appear before you today to discuss proposed legislation that would amend the Michigan statutes regulating the licensing and operation of funeral establishments and cemeteries in Michigan. Permitting joint ownership or operation of a funeral establishment and a cemetery could make possible new business formats and improvements in efficiency and could encourage entry of new competitors, which could in turn lead to lower prices and improved service to consumers. This testimony represents the views of

restrictions that hinder competition and increase costs without providing countervailing benefits to consumers.

The Commission and its staff have become familiar with the funeral industry through the promulgation and enforcement of a trade regulation rule that is intended to promote increased competition and consumer choice in the funeral industry by facilitating informed purchase decisions.(3) In addition, the Commission has taken law enforcement actions against anticompetitive acquisitions in the funeral industry.(4) The staff submitted comments to Senator Pridnia three years ago on legislation substantially similar to the legislation being considered by this

In other licensed and regulated businesses, such as health care, laws and regulations limiting “commercial practice” have been promoted based on the argument that they are necessary to maintain quality of service and protect the professional's independent judgment. Among other restrictions, these laws commonly prevent licensed professionals from entering into commercial relationships, including employment, with non-licensed persons or firms. But our experience with such restrictions, principally in licensed businesses and professions other than the funeral and cemetery industries, suggests that their effect is usually to reduce competition and increase prices. That effect should be weighed carefully against effects, if any, on quality of care or service that the restrictions are intended to promote.(10)

Restrictions on the business practices of professionals can reduce competition by preventing the introduction and development of innovative forms of professional practices that may be more efficient, provide comparable quality, and offer competitive alternatives to traditional providers. For example, in a case challenging various ethical code provisions that the American Medical Association (AMA) enforced, the Commission found that AMA rules prohibiting physicians from working on a salaried basis for hospitals or other lay institutions and from entering into partnerships or similar business relationships with non-physicians unreasonably restrained competition, and, as a result, violated federal antitrust laws.(11) The Commission concluded that the AMA's prohibitions kept physicians from adopting potentially efficient business formats and precluded competition from organizations not directly and completely under the control of physicians. The Commission also found that there were no countervailing procompetitive justifications for these restrictions.(12)

This reasoning might well apply to the funeral and cemetery businesses. Prohibiting jointly owned or operated facilities could prevent some efficient combinations of business practices of the two operations that might result in

(6) See comments to Wisconsin, September 13, 1993; Pennsylvania, March 24, 1994, and August 29, 1989; Virginia, February 9, 1989; Oregon, April 6, 1987; Illinois, May 9, 1986; Kansas, February 14, 1986; and Alabama, January 16, 1986. Commission staff has also testified generally on regulatory issues in the funeral industry. See Statement to California Assembly Committee on Consumer Protection, Governmental Efficiency and Economic Development, October 17, 1991.

(7) Mich. Comp. Laws § 339.1812(1).

(8) Mich. Comp. Laws § 339.1812(2).

(9) H.B. No. 4456, to amend Occupational Code, § 1812, Mich. Comp. Laws § 339.1812. Unlike the bills on which we commented three years ago, the legislation under consideration now does not include provisions to regulate prices and dealing with affiliated entities.

(10) See C. Cox and S. Foster, *The Costs and Benefits of Occupational Regulation*, October 1990 (FTC Bureau of Economics Staff Report). This report, a review of economic studies of licensing, finds that licensing frequently increases prices and imposes substantial costs, but that many licensing restrictions do not appear to increase the quality of service. The report recommends careful weighing of likely costs against prospective benefits. *Id.* at v. Where consumers are in a relatively poor position to evaluate the product or service, regulation of some kind can provide benefit to consumers. The Commission's Funeral Rule addresses the consumer's relative lack of knowledge, and potentially vulnerable state of mind when purchase decisions are often made, by requiring disclosures, rather than by regulating the service directly or controlling who can practice. See *Funeral Industry Practices*, 16 C.F.R. § 453.

(11) See *American Medical Ass'n*, 94 F.T.C. 701 (1979), *aff'd*, 638 F.2d 443 (2d Cir. 1980), *aff'd mem.* by an equally divided court, 455 U.S. 676 (1982).

(12) See also comment of the staff of the Federal Trade Commission on the American Bar Association's Model Rules of Professional Conduct, March 26, 1991, addressing issues raised by proposals to allow firms to provide ancillary, non-legal services. In that comment, the staff pointed out that law firm diversification could benefit consumers by allowing firms to provide an efficient mix of services that consumers seek, and that rules restricting such services could harm consumers by restricting consumer choice. The comment also analyzed how different proposals would meet concerns about professional standards and ethical obligations.