

## REMARKS OF COMMISSIONER BRILL FOR INTEL PRESS CONFERENCE

Let me just add a few additional points to what Chairman Leibowitz has said. I think this case is very important for a couple reasons.

First, maintaining competition in high-tech markets is one of the Commission's top competition priorities. As the Chairman has pointed out, these markets are responsible for many of the benefits we enjoy in our highly-wired society. And more critically, innovation in these markets helps drive our economy through introduction of new products and services, which in turns fuels the expansion of existing companies and the birth of new ones. Thus, the harm from anticompetitive conduct in these markets has wide-ranging effects across our economy. The fact that the Commission brought this case, and vigorously prosecuted it, demonstrates that the Commission will not hesitate to challenge conduct involving complex, high-tech products in fast-paced, innovation markets.

Second, this case is important because it shows that the Commission is actively engaged in enforcing the antitrust laws against monopolists who abuse their market position. This is not the first monopolization case the Commission has brought in recent years. The Commission has brought other monopolization cases -- in other high-tech markets where there has been abuse of the standard setting process (our Rambus case is an example), as well as conduct in the pharmaceutical industry where branded pharmaceutical manufacturers have acted to delay generic entry (our Cephalon case is a good example). Thus our case against Intel further demonstrates how active the Commission will be in monitoring monopolists.

It is also worth pointing out that, if this settlement is finalized after the public comment period, the Commission will continue to be vigilant in monitoring Intel's conduct for anticompetitive harm. Of course, the Commission can challenge and seek civil penalties against Intel for violating the settlement. In addition, the Commission also can challenge any harmful, anti-competitive practice that Intel may engage in the future, even if not specifically prohibited by the Proposed Consent Order. We are all hopeful that such action will not be necessary. However, we will not shrink the least bit from our duty to vigilantly ensure Intel's practices are within the bounds of the antitrust laws in the future.

Thank you.