



United States of America  
**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION**  
WASHINGTON, DC 20580

---

**Remarks of Commissioner Rebecca Kelly Slaughter<sup>1</sup>**

**Merger Retrospective Lessons from Mr. Rogers**  
**Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century:**  
**Merger Retrospectives**  
**April 12, 2019**

Thank you to the Chairman for convening today's hearing and these hearings writ large, and to everyone at the FTC, particularly our staff in the Office of Policy and Planning, for the monumental effort they have put into carrying out this ambitious endeavor. Thank you to the panelists who are here today to share their knowledge, expertise, and views about merger retrospectives. Some of you have been repeat players at our hearings and we appreciate the time and effort that you have given to this task.

Today's discussion of retrospectives is a key way these hearings can fulfill their mission, as described by Chairman Simons, to examine and evaluate the effectiveness of our enforcement and, where we identify areas for improvement, to implement reforms.

As I said at the second hearing session in September, these hearings cannot simply reaffirm our current policies and practices with a pat on our back. Any serious and credible wide-scale review of our enforcement and policy record must be able to identify ways in which we can improve.

This morning's panels involved extremely sophisticated and detailed economic and legal discussions of merger retrospectives. I'm going to take us in a completely different direction for a moment.

If any of you are or have recently been the parents or relatives of preschool age children, you may be familiar with the show Daniel Tiger. Daniel is the cartoonized son of the puppet tiger on Mr. Rogers' Neighborhood with whom many children of the 1960s, 70s and 80s grew up. Anyway Daniel is the current generation's version, and using the concepts and themes pioneered by Mr. Rogers, he teaches extremely helpful life lessons in fifteen minute segments, each punctuated by a unique summarizing song.

---

<sup>1</sup> The views expressed in these remarks are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Federal Trade Commission or any other Commissioner.

And I have discovered that there is a Daniel Tiger song for basically any situation - including, as it turns out, how to think about antitrust enforcement and merger retrospectives. A very frequently cited Daniel Tiger refrain in my house is one about making mistakes - and I will embarrass myself by singing it for you. Daniel teaches us:

“It’s okay to make mistakes, try to fix them and learn from them too.”

These are wise words for children, but they are important for adults as well, including antitrust enforcers. And while I would not say enforcement mistakes are “okay,” they are certainly inevitable, since merger review is generally an exercise in predictive analysis about how markets will operate after a proposed transaction is consummated.

This predictive nature provokes reference to the well-worn quote that: “Prediction is hard, especially when it’s about the future.” This quote has been variously attributed to Yogi Berra, Mark Twain, and apparently, Neils Bohr has a claim to it as well. It resonates because, even though we use our best economic and legal tools to make the most accurate predictions we can, we know that sometimes we may make mistakes. Of course, sometimes the evidence gathered in a merger investigation unambiguously predicts clear competitive harm that requires enforcement action.

For example, in the Tronox matter, the Commission successfully argued before several courts that the elimination of Cristal in the North American titanium dioxide market would have harmed competition. Just this week, the Commission announced a unanimous settlement that required a clean sweep divestiture of the relevant Cristal assets.<sup>2</sup>

In other instances, accurate prediction is substantially more difficult. While our predictions need not be absolute, correctly divining how a proposed merger will change firm behavior and market outcomes—especially on non-price factors, like quality and innovation—can be extremely challenging. Recent vertical mergers illustrate this well.

In the vertical merger context, predictions about how changes in firm behavior will influence competition are often more complicated and may be less clear. Two people in good faith can disagree about the merits of a given prediction and ultimately the propriety—or legal viability—of enforcement action.

But what I think we can all agree on is that the Commission’s predictions and its enforcement decisions can profoundly impact competition and consumers for many years. There is an enormous weight on our shoulders to make the right decision about the fate of a merger. This responsibility extends beyond the time at which we evaluate proposed mergers; it also requires us to improve upon our predictions and to correct erroneous decisions that resulted in competitive harm.

And that is where we do well to heed Daniel’s call to try to fix our mistakes, and learn from them too. That is precisely what merger retrospectives can do. They can help us to “check our work”

---

<sup>2</sup> In the Matter Tronox/Cristal USA, File No. 171-0085 (April 10, 2019), <https://www.ftc.gov/enforcement/cases-proceedings/171-0085/tronoxcristal-usa>.

to test the accuracy of our predictions about a given merger. They can help test the usefulness of models and other tools of analysis to inform future merger investigations, which, as Chairman Simons noted this morning, affirmatively helps our enforcement efforts. The hospital merger retrospective study initiated by Chairman Muris, which resulted in a new strategy for successfully challenging anticompetitive hospital mergers can



On this last question, I want to emphasize an additional point. The Commission often must review mergers in technology-intensive industries well before they have matured. Retrospectives may be particularly useful to inform our understanding of how these industries evolve and how mergers in the early stages of such industries' life cycles effect nascent competition and influence industry structure, growth, and dynamism.

In this way, merger retrospectives can support our other technologically focused enforcement efforts, such as the Bureau of Competition's Technology Task Force.

I look forward to hearing from this afternoon's panelists and thank you again to all of today's participants.