

Working for business.  
Working for Australia



# Submission on options to strengthen the misuse of market power law

February 2016



Australian  
Chamber of Commerce  
and Industry

**WORKING FOR BUSINESS.  
WORKING FOR AUSTRALIA**  
Telephone 02 6270 8000  
Email [info@acci.asn.au](mailto:info@acci.asn.au)  
Website [www.acci.asn.au](http://www.acci.asn.au)

**CANBERRA OFFICE**  
Commerce House  
Level 3, 24 Brisbane Avenue  
Barton ACT 2600 PO BOX 6005  
Kingston ACT 2604

**MELBOURNE OFFICE**  
Level 2, 150 Collins Street  
Melbourne VIC 3000  
PO BOX 18008  
Collins Street East  
Melbourne VIC 8003

**SYDNEY OFFICE**  
Level 15, 140 Arthur Street  
North Sydney NSW 2060  
Locked Bag 938  
North Sydney NSW 2059

© Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry 2015  
ABN 85 008 391 795

This work is copyright. No part of this publication may be reproduced or used in any way without acknowledgement to the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry.

**Disclaimers & Acknowledgements**

The Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has taken reasonable care in publishing the information contained in this publication but does not guarantee that the information is complete, accurate or current. In particular, the Australian Chamber is not responsible for the accuracy of information that has been provided by other parties. The information in this publication is not intended to be used as the basis for making any investment decision and must not be relied upon as investment advice. To the maximum extent permitted by law, the Australian Chamber disclaims all liability (including liability in negligence) to any person arising out of use or reliance on the information contained in this publication including for loss or damage which you or anyone else might suffer as a result of that use or reliance.

The Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry speaks on behalf of Australian business at home and abroad. We represent more than 300,000 businesses of all sizes, across all industries and all parts of the country, making us Australia's most representative business organisation.

The Australian Chamber supports the full adoption of the Harper Review's recommended changes (Option F).

There is nothing wrong with firms obtaining market power by competing on merit through better products, production that is more efficient and distribution or marketing that is more effective. However, for market-based economies to function effectively, dominant firms must be at risk of losing their market share if a more efficient competitor emerges. New entrants must have the opportunity to enter a market without handicaps other than those arising from the fact that existing competitors have first mover advantages, such as well-established ties with consumers and skilled employees.

The fact that small, remote countries like Australia tend towards high levels of market dominance mean that it is particularly important for Australia's competition laws to be robust. The threat of competition is vital in markets with natural monopoly characteristics, as the only means of encouraging firms to continue innovating and limit their ability to increase profits at the expense of consumers using their market power.

The Australian Chamber contends

- The concept of 'a substantial lessening of competition' is sufficient to distinguish anticompetitive and procompetitive conduct, although the additional elements proposed by Harper serve to emphasise the importance of protecting behaviour that results in better outcomes for consumers.
- The take advantage test is peculiar to Australia. With no basis in economics it serves only to protect conduct that should be judged anticompetitive.
- The purpose test is similarly problematic. At best it can be contorted to match some but not all of the tests typically used to determine whether conduct is anticompetitive in other jurisdictions.

### **Substantial lessening of competition is a sufficient test**

The concept of 'a substantial lessening of competition' is sufficient to distinguish anticompetitive and procompetitive conduct. The United States and Europe, along with most other jurisdictions, use similar general tests with no evidence of a chilling effect on competition or significantly higher legal costs.

Firms are unequivocally safe if they compete on merit through the development of better products, processes that are more efficient, or even marketing that is more effective.

Problems only arise if conduct would tend to exclude an equally efficient competitor (the 'as efficient competitor' test) or would not be profitable, or a reasonable business decision, absent the exclusionary consequences (the 'profit sacrifice' and 'no economic sense' tests).

While it is possible for conduct to have procompetitive and anticompetitive effects, the risk of over-capture is low as courts overseas have erred on the side of protecting any behaviour that could be characterised as offering better outcomes to consumers. The additional elements in the Harper

recommendation, such as the need to consider the effect on innovation, merely emphasise this presumption.

Ironically, one of the areas where it is most difficult to make the distinction between competitive and anticompetitive conduct is exclusive dealing.<sup>1</sup> Yet despite the fact that section 47 subjects exclusive dealing to a substantial lessening of competition test absent any take advantage or purpose elements, there is no evidence that exclusive dealing rules have resulted in noticeable adverse effects on legal costs or on competition.

### **The take advantage test is inherently protective of anticompetitive conduct**

The 'take advantage test' is inherently protective of conduct that should be considered anticompetitive. US courts clearly recognise that the same behaviour can be benign for a firm in a competitive market, but anticompetitive for a firm with market power.<sup>2</sup>

The need to show that the conduct in question could not have been undertaken by a firm without market power is peculiar to Australia,<sup>3</sup> and has no basis in economics.

For example, a vertically integrated firm in competitive markets may refuse to deal with its competitors without affecting competition. However, if that same firm were to acquire market power in one market and refused to supply competitors in key linked markets then there is a serious risk of that conduct substantially lessening competition (absent some other concern such as credit worthiness).

At best, the relevant nexus between market power and whether conduct is anticompetitive should relate to the anticompetitive effect of the conduct is the result of a firm's market power, not whether market power is what enabled the firm to undertake the conduct in the first place.

US law goes even further, recognising that even conduct by firms without market power can be anticompetitive by prohibiting attempted monopolisation as well as monopolisation under section 2 of the Sherman Act.<sup>4</sup>

### **The purpose test is not fit for purpose**

Supporters of the 'purpose test' argue, contradictorily, that it is crucial to identifying anticompetitive conduct, and that removing it would make little difference to the operation of section 46.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive dealing arrangements can intensify competition where retailers act as agents of their consumers in driving down wholesale costs. See Murphy, K. and Klein, B., 2008, 'Exclusive Dealing Intensifies Competition for Distribution', *Antitrust Law Journal*, Vol. 75, No. 2. [http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1656635](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1656635)

<sup>2</sup> In finding Dentsply International Inc guilty of using exclusive dealing to maintain its market power in the market for artificial teeth, the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit noted that "Behavior that otherwise might comply with antitrust law may be impermissibly exclusionary when practiced by a monopolist." See Sher, S A and Russell, 2005, Adding Bite to Exclusive Dealing?: An Analysis of the Third Circuit's Dentsply Decision, *theantitrustsource*, May 2005. [https://www.wsgr.com/PDFSearch/AntitrustSource\\_may05\\_sher.pdf](https://www.wsgr.com/PDFSearch/AntitrustSource_may05_sher.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Crampton, P. 2006, "Abuse" of "dominance" in Canada: building on the international experience', *Antitrust Law Journal*, Vol. 73, No. 3, pp. 803-867, p. 829.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Code: Title 15 - Commerce and Trade, Section 2: <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/15/2>

<sup>5</sup> Compare page 15 of the BCA submission on the draft Harper Report with the same page of the BCA submission on the final Harper report. BCA, 2014, *Submission on the Competition Policy Review Draft Report*, <http://competitionpolicyreview.gov.au/files/2014/12/BCA.pdf>; BCA, 2015, *Submission on the Competition Policy Review Draft*

The telecommunications industry clearly shows the benefits of introducing an effects test, with the government noting that the changes were effective in curbing anticompetitive practices such as internet peering and commercial churn.<sup>6</sup>

If purpose is defined subjectively then it encourages a laborious search for a smoking gun that is only probative in whether conduct is really anticompetitive.

If purpose is defined objectively, then it could deliver similar results to the 'profit sacrifice' and 'no economic sense' test. However, there are forms of anticompetitive conduct that may pass the 'profit sacrifice' and 'no economic sense' tests but would still tend to foreclose an equally efficient competitor. Examples of such conduct include:

- a firm using its dominant position in part of the upstream supply chain to increase prices, which raises its own profits, but also tends to exclude equally efficient competitors in the downstream market; or
- a dominant retailer using favourable shelf position to promote its own brand products over those of independent suppliers that may have products that are equally attractive to consumers.

---

*Report*, [http://www.bca.com.au/docs/4c945237-4f4f-4014-8baa-faa69423d6d3/BCA\\_Submission\\_on\\_the\\_Final\\_Report\\_of\\_the\\_Competition\\_Policy\\_Review\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.bca.com.au/docs/4c945237-4f4f-4014-8baa-faa69423d6d3/BCA_Submission_on_the_Final_Report_of_the_Competition_Policy_Review_FINAL.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> See Supplementary Explanatory Memorandum to the *Telecommunications Legislation Amendment Bill 1998*. <https://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/C2004B00254/Supplementary%20Explanatory%20Memorandum/Text> The Internet peering issue involved Telstra charging to carry competitors' Internet traffic on its network while refusing to pay its competitors for their carriage of its traffic. Commercial churn is the transfer of customers from one carrier or carriage service provider to another.

## Australian Chamber Members

**AUSTRALIAN CHAMBER MEMBERS:** BUSINESS SA CANBERRA BUSINESS CHAMBER CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
NORTHERN TERRITORY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRY QUEENSLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE &  
INDUSTRY WESTERN AUSTRALIA NEW SOUTH WALES BUSINESS CHAMBER TASMANIAN CHAMBER OF  
COMMERCE & INDUSTRY VICTORIAN' CHAMBER OF COMMERCE & INDUSTRY **MEMBER NATIONAL INDUSTRY**  
**ASSOCIATIONS:** ACCORD – HYGIENE, COSMETIC & SPECIALTY PRODUCTS INDUSTRY **AGED AND COMMUNITY**  
**SERVICES AUSTRALIA** AIR CONDITIONING & MECHANICAL CONTRACTORS' ASSOCIATION **ASSOCIATION OF**  
**FINANCIAL ADVISERS** ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS OF NSW **AUSTRALIAN SUBSCRIPTION**  
**TELEVISION AND RADIO ASSOCIATION** AUSTRALIAN BEVERAGES COUNCIL LIMITED AUSTRALIAN DENTAL  
ASSOCIATION AUSTRALIAN DENTAL INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION OF EMPLOYERS &  
INDUSTRIES AUSTRALIAN FEDERATION OF TRAVEL AGENTS **AUSTRALIAN FOOD & GROCERY COUNCIL**  
AUSTRALIAN HOTELS ASSOCIATION **AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL AIRLINES OPERATIONS GROUP**  
AUSTRALIAN MADE CAMPAIGN LIMITED **AUSTRALIAN MINES & METALS ASSOCIATION** AUSTRALIAN PAINT  
MANUFACTURERS' FEDERATION **AUSTRALIAN RECORDING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION** AUSTRALIAN RETAILERS'  
ASSOCIATION AUSTRALIAN SELF MEDICATION INDUSTRY AUSTRALIAN STEEL INSTITUTE **AUSTRALIAN**  
**TOURISM AWARDS INC** AUSTRALIAN TOURISM EXPORT COUNCIL **AUSTRALIAN VETERINARY ASSOCIATION**  
BUS INDUSTRY CONFEDERATION **BUSINESS COUNCIL OF CO-OPERATIVES AND MUTUALS** CARAVAN  
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA CEMENT CONCRETE AND AGGREGATES AUSTRALIA COMMERCIAL  
RADIO AUSTRALIA CONSULT AUSTRALIA CUSTOMER OWNED BANKING ASSOCIATION FITNESS AUSTRALIA  
CRUISE LINES INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION DIRECT SELLING ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA EXHIBITION AND  
EVENT ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALASIA FITNESS AUSTRALIA **HOUSING INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION** HIRE AND  
RENTAL INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION LTD. **LARGE FORMAT RETAIL ASSOCIATION** LIVE PERFORMANCE AUSTRALIA  
**MASTER BUILDERS AUSTRALIA** MASTER PLUMBERS' & MECHANICAL SERVICES ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA  
**MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA** NATIONAL DISABILITY SERVICES NATIONAL  
ELECTRICAL & COMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION NATIONAL FIRE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION NATIONAL RETAIL  
ASSOCIATION NATIONAL ROAD AND MOTORISTS' ASSOCIATION NSW TAXI COUNCIL NATIONAL ONLINE RETAIL  
ASSOCIATION **OIL INDUSTRY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION** PHARMACY GUILD OF AUSTRALIA **PHONOGRAPHIC**  
**PERFORMANCE COMPANY OF AUSTRALIA** PLASTICS & CHEMICALS INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION **RESTAURANT &**  
**CATERING AUSTRALIA** SCREEN PRODUCERS AUSTRALIA **VICTORIAN AUTOMOBILE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**