One scenario in which behavioralmedies may be appropriate is when the challenged merger has long since been consummatedivestiture or othrestructural remedies are not a viable option for restoring competition te-merger levels. Given that Graco has fully integrated Gusmer and Glascraft and discontinued product lines, divestiture is not an option and the Commission should rightly consider whether havioral remedies in this case would protect consumers.

As with merger remedies generally, when **diragi** whether and what behavioral remedy to impose, the Commission must ultimately **bye**ided by its mission of protecting consumers.

¹ See e.g.

business. On the other hand, the economic rister is replete with procompetitive justifications for exclusive dealing, inclured aligning the incentives of manufacturers and distributors, preventing freeding, and facilitating relationship-specific investments. In fact, the empirical evidence substantifications the view that excessive dealing arrangements are much more likely to be procompetitive than anticompetitive.

Because exclusive dealing contracts typically procompetitive and a part of the normal competitive process, the Commission should **orely**trict the use of such arrangements when there is sufficient evidence that they have or are likely to decrease consumer welfare. This ensures consumers the merger remedy does not deprive them the fruits of the competitive process. The evidence in this case is insufficient to conclude that Graco has used, or intends to use, exclusive dealing one factoexclusive contracts to foreclastivals and ultimately harm consumers. To the contrary, the Commission processive arrangements. Specifically, the Complaint acknowledges the sale of fast sequipment demands specializated party distributors that possess the technical expertised consumers how to used amaintain the manufacturer's equipment. One could therefore easily imagine at the manufacturers might only be willing to provide training to distributors if they have some assurance that current or future competitors will be unable to free ride on their investments the distributors' technic expertise. Exclusive dealing arrangements with substitutors are one well-knowmal common method of preventing such free riding.

The provisions in the Order prohibiting excites contracts therefore may needlessly harm consumers by deterring potentially procompetitience angements. For that reason, I do not believe that provision is the public interest.

III. Restrictions on Loyalty Discounts

The primary anticompetitive concerns with loyaddiscounts are analytically similar to those associated with exclusive dealing and factoexclusive contracts. As with exclusive dealing, the economic literature also supports the viterat loyalty discounts mre often than not are procompetitive. The Commission's competition missiotherefore is best served by an

_

⁶ See e.g.Alden F. Abbott & Joshua D. Wright,