



THE SOCIETY OF THE PLASTICS INDUSTRY, INC.
250 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017 • 212/687-2675

MINUTES

MARKET DEVELOPMENT MEETING OF THE PLASTIC BOTTLE DIVISION

N.Y. Hilton Hotel
New York, N.Y.

November 17, 1971
9:30 a.m.

Present:

Don Lewis, Chairman, Monsanto Co., 800 N. Lindbergh Blvd., St. Louis, Mo. 63166
John M. McDonald, Jr., Vice Chairman, Continental Can Co., Inc., 633 Third Avenue,
New York, N.Y. 10017
J. J. Asbeck, B.F. Goodrich Chemical Co., 3135 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio 44115
R. F. Attebery, U. S. Industrial Chemicals, 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016
Ken Auer, Diamond Shamrock Chemical Corp., 300 Union Commerce Bldg., Cleveland, Ohio
Robert D. Bishop, Imco Container Co., 4240 Blue Ridge Blvd., Kansas City, Mo. 64133
John J. Giachetto, U. S. I. Chemicals Co., 99 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10016
C. R. Holt, Marbon Div., Borg-Warner Corp., P.O. Box 68, Washington, W. Va. 26181
Dr. Steve Kozak, Celanese Plastics Co., Morris Court, Summit, N.J. 07901
Thomas W. Millen, Union Carbide Corp., 1 Cory Road, Morristown, N.J. 07960
S. F. Peirce, Continental Can Co., 633 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
S. J. Rupert, Uniloy Div., Hoover Ball & Bearing Company, P.O. Box 98, Saline, Mich.
Harriet Selz, Titan Plastics, Inc., 155 Berkeley Ave., Newark, N.J. 07107
M. E. Smith, Owens-Illinois, Plastic Products Div., P.O. Box 1035, Toledo, Ohio
Sam Tisser, Kaysam Corp. of America, 27 Kentucky Ave., Paterson, N.J. 07503
Thomas J. McGrath, Staff Administrator, SPI, 250 Park Avenue, N.Y., N.Y. 10017

CHAIRMAN'S OPENING REMARKS

Committee Chairman, Don Lewis, Monsanto Co., welcomed the attendees to the second meeting of the Market Development Committee. He was pleased to announce that at lunch today our guest speaker will be Kenneth Michel, Vice President and General Manager of the Plastic Container Division of Continental Can Co., and Chairman of the SPI Plastics Council. Mr. Michel will give us an overview of the Council's operations and objectives. He stated in previous meetings that there were questions as to the overall scope of operations of the SPI, and he asked the Staff Administrator to bring copies of the SPI Annual Report. Mr. Lewis said he has read the Annual Report and found it to be excellent and one which clearly describes the scope of operations of the SPI. He also commented that a letter was mailed to the Division members on the date of October 18th, which contained a fact sheet on

SPI-24155

plastic bottles and the environment. The letter and fact sheet was prepared by the Promotion Committee, and the comments he has received from members of the Monsanto Co. was that this was one of the best statements regarding plastic bottles' relationship to the environment that they have seen from the SPI.

He advised that the Subcommittee Chairman held a meeting yesterday afternoon to review their activities. He requested the members of this Committee to send any information or questions they may have regarding any area of plastic bottles to the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman.

He called for the usual self-introductions and following the introductions inquired if there were any corrections to be made to the September 14, 1971 minutes. There were no corrections to be made and a motion was made, seconded, and carried that the minutes of the September 14th meeting be approved as distributed.

REPORT ON NEW YORK CITY PLASTIC PACKAGING TAX

The Staff Administrator was pleased to inform the members about our successful court suit against New York City's discriminatory plastic packaging tax. The court declared the tax unconstitutional. The Staff Administrator gave a brief overview of what transpired during the trial. Following his report there were questions regarding the Staff Administrator's opinion as to whether the city will appeal the decision. He advised that since there appeared to be no logical basis for the city to appeal the case, they probably will appeal.

He briefly reported that the situation regarding the deposit bill in New Jersey and the proposed banning of PVC packaging in Michigan are under control, at least until the next session of the respective legislatures.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Household and Industrial Chemicals Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chairman Sam Peirce, Continental Can, discussed the requirements promulgated under the Poison Prevention Act as they relate to safety closures. He stated that the Closures Subcommittee of the Division's Technical Committee met with the Closures Committee of the Glass Container Manufacturers' Institute on November 10th. The result of that meeting was cordial and a good liaison has been established. The FDA has published a protocol regarding child safety closures which is a performance standard. The problem encountered with the protocol is that the closure manufacturer may have his closure tested by two hundred children, five years of age, and achieve the desired results; however, the subsequent test by the user, using two hundred different children, five years old, may result in substantially different results. The Glass Container Manufacturers' Institute has gone on record with the FDA opposing a performance standard and requesting that a physical standard be prepared because of the almost impossibility of obtaining reproducible results under the present scheme of testing equipment.

Mr. Peirce advised that yesterday we discussed the area of product liability. It appears that when a package breaks and the contents are hazardous to the individual, everyone connected with the package gets sued. Several of the bottle division members are presently in this unfortunate predicament and we discussed the possibility

SPI-24156

of obtaining a pool of expert witnesses who could be called upon to testify that the plastic bottle was made in accordance with accepted procedures. The attendees were requested to review this area and let the Staff Administrator know of any people whom they feel could qualify as expert witnesses.

Sam Peirce concluded his report by stating that his Committee is proposing that the Bottle Division Promotion Committee prepare an article on the floor-care market. The article would discuss waxes and polishes, rug shampoos and cleaners, and wax removers. They feel that a story about this market could be very helpful when one considers the wide use of plastic containers for the floor-care market as well as the plastic floor coverings and the plastic materials used in the waxes and polishes themselves.

Cosmetic and Toiletries Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chairman Bob Bishop reported that his Committee would like to see the Division undertake the establishment of a Technical Bulletin covering heat transfer labels. His Committee will review this area and supply the Technical Committee with input for the Technical Bulletin.

His Committee is also working on developing a "value story" about the cosmetic and toiletries market. This market is approximately three billion units with one-half in plastic containers. He will attempt to break down the market into various segments and determine the size of each segment as well as its rate of conversion into plastic.

It was recommended that each member provide Bob Bishop with whatever information his company has about the size of the cosmetic and toiletries market as this will greatly facilitate Bob's very difficult task in defining the segments. Tom Mullen of the Union Carbide Corp. volunteered to supply some statistical information which Union Carbide has developed to Bob Bishop.

Food and Drug Subcommittee Report

Subcommittee Chairman Matt Smith reported that the FDA is moving more into the food area, specifically, investigatory work. Traditionally, the FDA has spent most of its time concerned with drug applications, however, the trend now appears to be in food processing plants.

Matt Smith reviewed the latest developments with the Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division of I.R.S. He reported that Jerry Heckman has advised us that, in late October, Mr. Harold Meek of ATFD called Mr. Heckman and advised that no adverse supplier comments had been filed in response to the September 17, 1970 industry circular. However, Mr. Meek did advise that the Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue Service, Mr. William Loeb, who is charged with deciding such matters for I.R.S., had reached the conclusion, after some discussions with environmental protection agency officials, that ATFD will definitely have to go through the rather complex procedures required of Federal Agencies by Section 102 (2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

What has happened is that ATFD has made the policy decision that allowing the use of PVC liquor bottles would constitute the taking of an action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Thus, it must go through the

procedures indicated in the guidelines. Mr. Hackman is presently in the process of preparing the necessary information to submit to Mr. Meek. By way of background, Mr. Smith advised that the nature of the process outlined in the Environmental Policy Act is to make public proposed federal government actions that will have an impact on the environment. The burden is on the federal agency to file this statement and not on the private party to be regulated.

Mr. Hackman has advised that, "The objective of a statement must be to provide a basis for evaluating impact on the environment of proposed federal agency actions so such statements must include:

- a. A technical description of the proposed action.
- b. The probable impact of the proposed action on the environment, including primary and secondary consequences.
- c. Any probable adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided.
- d. Alternatives to the proposed action.
- e. The relationship between local short-term uses of the environment and the maintenance of long-term productivity.
- f. Any irreversible commitment to resources.
- g. After circulation of the draft statement to appropriate government agencies, private organizations and individuals, a discussion when necessary of any problems or objections raised by these appropriate parties.

"The procedure is initiated by the lead Federal Agency (IRS) which is required to write a draft environmental statement to the Council on Environmental Quality and any other appropriate government agency, private organization or individual that has jurisdiction by law or special expertise over the subject matter so that they can comment on the lead agency's proposed action. The draft statement must also be made available to the public.

"The secondary agencies then have a specific time period in which to comment upon the proposed action of the lead agency. That time period must be established by the lead agency, and they differ among the agencies, but shall not be less than 30 days. Extensions of time for comment may be sought by the secondary agencies, whereby the lead agencies may grant such extensions for periods of time up to 15 days. If the secondary agency comments upon the proposed action of the lead agency, the secondary agency must return those comments, in writing, to the lead agency and then send 10 copies of those comments to CEQ. Upon expiration of the time for comment, with no response from secondary agencies, the lead agency may assume that no comments will be forthcoming and may proceed to the next step."

Continuing his reading from Mr. Hackman's report, Matt advised that, "Upon receiving comments, if any, from appropriate parties, which also must be made available to the public by those parties, the lead agency may then also extract an environmental impact statement to reflect these comments. In any event, the lead agency must then write a final environmental impact statement and submit 10 copies of this statement, which also must be made available to the public, to CEQ. There is no time limit placed on the lead agency to draft this final statement.

"The CEQ then reviews the final statement to insure that the proposed agency action is consistent with the stated environmental policies of the federal government. However, CEQ has no veto power over the lead agencies action and can only make further comments on the proposed action to the lead agency or to the President.

The lead agency still has the ultimate authority to grant or deny its own proposed action, agency action in question. There is no limit to the time in which CEQ may make comments, but the lead agency should not take any final action until 30 days have elapsed from the time the final environmental impact statement was filed with CEQ and until 90 days have elapsed from the time the initial draft statement was filed with CEQ."

Mr. Smith commented that we can see this is a complicated procedure and to our knowledge, the PVC liquor bottle will be the first product to go through this procedure. We are all watching this very carefully and Mr. Heckman will submit a draft copy of his comments to the members of the Bottle Division for their review.

Regarding our activities with the PMA in obtaining generic approval for polyolefins, he advised that, due to Mr. Heckman's involvement in the New York City court test, we have not proceeded as quickly with the PMA on this as had been desired.

Some of the members have expressed concern that because of the turn of events at the ATFD we may further delay the obtaining of approval from PMA, and Mr. Smith, on behalf of the Committee, will discuss this with Mr. Heckman to determine what steps can be taken to hasten the approval.

Milk Bottle Subcommittee

Subcommittee Chairman, Sam Rupert of Uniloy, advised that at the last meeting he discussed the Paper Board Packaging Council's Cost Study which placed the use of plastic milk bottles at a competitive disadvantage. He stated that DeBell and Richardson had published a study comparing the cost of plastic milk bottles vs. the plastic-coated paper carton, and that he would seek to obtain DeBell and Richardson's permission to summarize the results of their study and have it published in the Plastic Bottle Bulletin. He was happy to advise that DeBell and Richardson has given us permission, and publication of their study will help correct the misleading figures of the Paperboard Packaging Council.

Regarding Professor Bernard's (Penn State) report, Sam Rupert and Fred Kaufman have tried unsuccessfully to contact him. By way of background, Professor Bernard gave a talk in which he showed that plastic milk bottles caused greater light penetration than glass or paper, thereby spoiling the milk quicker. The Ex-Cell-O Co. ran advertisements in the southeast, highlighting the comparison which Professor Bernard made in his talk, and ignoring the Professor's comments that these figures should not be compared. It now appears that the Ex-Cell-O campaign has backfired in that a number of the dairies have complained about its inaccuracy, and it is our understanding that the campaign has been stopped.

Mr. Rupert advised that his Committee is reviewing the statistical growth of plastic milk bottles for a story to be presented in the Plastic Bottle Bulletin.

PROMOTION COMMITTEE REPORT

Promotion Committee Chairman Jim Asbeck reported on the activities of the Plastic Bottle Division's Promotion Committee.

(Please note: A copy of Mr. Asbeck's report is attached to the minutes as Exhibit A.)

WASTE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Chairman Don Lewis reported that Fred Kaufman, Chairman of the Bottle Division Waste Management Committee, was unable to attend the meeting and he requested the Staff Administrator to briefly review the listing of plastic recycling programs which was attached to the meeting announcement. The Staff Administrator briefly reviewed and highlighted those programs which appeared to be the more feasible ones.

GUEST SPEAKER

Following lunch, Don Lewis called upon John McDonald of Continental Can Co. to introduce our guest speaker, an old friend and former Division Chairman, Ken Michel. Ken is presently the Chairman of the SPI's Plastics Council, and he discussed the activities of the Council as well as its purpose and objectives.

Following Ken's talk, there was a question-and-answer period, and all the attendees complimented Mr. Michel on his excellent talk.

(Please note: A copy of Mr. Michel's talk is attached to the minutes as Exhibit B.)

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING

It was agreed that we would hold our next meeting in New York City on February 29, 1972. Members are requested to give suggestions to John McDonald for future luncheon speakers.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to transact, the meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. McGrath
Staff Administrator
Plastic Bottle Division

TJMcG/fd

PROMOTION COMMITTEE REPORT 11/17/71

The Promotion Committee has been quite active since our last report. As is the case this week, our meeting was held the day after yours and the following items were covered:

1. Environmental Advisory Committee's work on the consumer response letter was completed and approved. Distribution was limited to official representatives, market development and promotion committee members. Comments have ranged that this letter was better than average to: This is the most positive ecological statement to be issued by the S.P.I. thus far.
 - a. Do you desire further distribution?
2. Our efforts to create a positive statement in the form of a consumer environmental brochure were far less successful.
 - a. While Burson-Marsteller's promotional activities for plastic containers continue to be excellent, they appear to have a mental block when it comes to positive aspects of plastic and the environment.
 - b. B.M. will make one more effort in this area and the draft will be reviewed.
 - c. Bud Lane, P.R., Plastics Council, will work with us on production of the bottle oriented consumer publication.
3. Executive Committee has approved a seminar for 1972. The seminar subcommittee consists of Messrs. Bill Bolton, Chairman, Frank Harris, Aim, Dick Lemkuhal, O.I., Tom Mullen, U.C., Jim Rollins, Monsanto, and Bob Wakefield, U.S.I.
 - a. A detailed report will be submitted to the Executive Committee at our January meeting.
 - b. Tentative date of first week in April pending satisfactory approval, speaker availability, and space arrangements.
4. The mailing list will be reviewed along with other subjects on the attached agenda at the Summit Hotel at 9:00 A.M. in the presidential suite.

Respectfully submitted
Promotion Committee

J. J. Asbeck, Chairman

MARKET DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
PLASTIC BOTTLE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 17, 1971

Four Years ago the Bottle Division was probably the first plastics group to be sensitive to the ecological ramifications of plastics. We elected Fred Kaufman of Sinclair-Koppers as a one-man committee to be our environmental watchdog. Since that time, all hell has broken loose with Richard D. Vaughan, Director of Solid Waste Management for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, stating how bad PVC was to our environment, and numerous publications such as Concern, etc.

These actions moved many of the people in the plastic container industry but failed to move the industry in total. Early this year, we considered assessing the Bottle Division to establish a public relations program to tell the story of plastics for the Bottle Division, and thought in terms of raising \$250,000. In May I attended a Board of Directors meeting where we fought tooth and nail in attempting to establish an environmental fund for the industry. Our ecological concern was not shared by the industry. Many people thought flammability and safety were more important than our potential ecological problems. We did raise \$219,000, however, which did include expenditures for flammability and safety.

On July 1, the City of New York passed the plastics tax. We, of The SPI, notified them that we were going to sue them and hired Shea, Gallop Climenko & Gould to represent us. Our lawyers (Continental Can Company) stated that the case could cost us \$250,000. On July 15, there was a meeting of a number of interested companies in an effort to raise some money to fight the City of New York. This was the birth of the Plastics Packaging Council. The Council has a seven member steering committee. I am chairman and Joe Temple, General Manager Plastics Department, Dow Chemical, is vice chairman; Joe and Fred Sutro, General Manager Plastics Department, USS Chemicals, Division of U. S. Steel, are the membership committee; Gus Linden, Vice President and General Manager Plastics and Resin, Allied Chemical, is treasurer; and the other members are George Babcock, Vice President, Owens-Illinois; Vern Larson, Vice President and General Manager Plastic Products Division, Union Carbide; and Ev Yelton, Assistant General Manager, Plastics Department, DuPont. We also nominated Bud Lane, Manager Advertising and Public Relations, B. F. Goodrich, as chairman of the public relations committee.

In its four months of life the Council changed its name to the Plastics Council and established that the purpose of the Council is threefold: to prevent and defeat restrictive, unfair legislation; to promote the positive benefits of

plastics through a broad-base public information program; and to support efforts aimed at the solution of our nation's major environmental problems.

The Council has had some \$300,000 pledged and took over the economical burden from The SPI of legislative and public relations activities associated with the ecological implications of short life cycled plastics.

The Council has 52 member companies, which is only 5% of The SPI. In my opinion, the Council did a good job in:

1. Legally fighting the case
2. Laying the groundwork for establishing a public affairs program.
3. Getting financial systems established.

In my opinion, the Council did a poor job in controlling the first month's expenditures and obtaining membership and dollars.

On November 4, the Council had a meeting in Chicago which I feel was very successful. We had Henry King, president of the U. S. Brewers Association as our keynote speaker, who did an outstanding job. Their ecological problems started back with prohibition so they have had tremendous experience and they currently have a budget of \$9 million. We brought the Council up-to-date. As of that time, we had pledges of \$301,500 and forecasted expenditures of

\$359,563, leaving us in a deficit position of some \$57,500. The SPI's Board of Directors stated they would cover our deficit up to a maximum of \$ 50,000 for 1971. This leaves us with a deficit of \$7,500 as of that date. However, we have obtained more members since, which takes us out of a deficit position.

Where did we spend \$360,000?

Exhibits	\$ 9,000
Legal and Bond	158,000
Office Supplies	900 "
Printing and Postage	25,000
Public Relations	79,000
Retainer and Expenses	78,000

We then recommended that the membership to the Council triple their contributions so that we would have a war chest of \$975,000 for 1972.

How would we spend it?

Public Affairs	\$495,000
Legal	150,000
Opinion Surveys	65,000
Projects Under Consideration	165,000
Contingency	100,000

It is forecasted that the contingency fund will probably be spent legally. The \$165,000 for Projects Under

Consideration concerns itself with such programs as:

- Recycling Development
- Recycling Centers
- Recycling Vans
- Incineration Development
- National Center
- Keep America Beautiful

Of the 50 companies present, 49 voted to endorse the Council's 1972 program, approve the Council's 1972 budget, recommend approval by their companies of the triple rate schedule, and also voted that we start immediately with Hill and Knowlton, our new public relations agency to start our public affairs program as of that date in lieu of waiting until January 1.

Since that meeting you have all, undoubtedly, heard that Judge Streit decided that the New York City tax law on plastics was unconstitutional, invalid and void, and we are extremely pleased. His opinion also presents a new ecological front stating that plastics do not present an especially difficult solid waste collection and disposal problem and that PVC containers do not constitute a special environmental problem.

We do not know whether or not the City will appeal but it would have to file a Notice of Intention to Appeal

within 30 days of the judgment, so we will not know whether we have to fight an appeal until approximately December 15; and if we did it would be in the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

As I stated, we have hired Hill and Knowlton to handle our public affairs and will spend some \$495,000 with them in 1972. I would like to tell you something about Hill and Knowlton and the proposed public affairs program for the Plastics Council. The program will comprise the following ten basic elements:

1. Legislative Surveillance.
2. Analysis of Actions and Recommendations.
3. Government Relations Audit.
4. Quick Response System.
5. Communications Programs for
 - A. Solid Waste Disposal Officials
 - B. Legislators
 - C. Editors and Writers
 - D. Environmentalists
 - E. Civic Groups
6. Develop Materials tailored for
 - Legislative Representatives
 - Hearing Witnesses.
7. Government Relations Manual.
8. Solid Waste Problems.
9. Building Customer Confidence.
10. Primary Audiences.

1. LEGISLATIVE SURVEILLANCE

In all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and major cities, they are beginning immediately to assemble a matrix of the legislative challenges which are confronting the plastics industry. This includes reports of bills which have been introduced, as well as legislative and administrative actions.

2. ANALYSIS OF ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We in the plastics industry also will need guidance on the nature of each bill contemplated or introduced. Thus, there will be provided through this network a thorough analysis of the seriousness of key actions, and recommendations for responses which may be required.

3. GOVERNMENT RELATIONS AUDIT

We in the plastics industry probably have more political strength than we know and more friends than we realize. This strength must be identified, assembled and deployed as quickly as possible. Simultaneously, with the establishment of the legislative surveillance system, they will conduct a Government Relations Audit of our industry's own capabilities. Once identified, these forces will be woven into the overall public relations and legislative effort. Part of the aim of the audit will be to mobilize labor and business groups, industry associates, citizen

organizations, our suppliers of goods and services (anyone who will benefit in some way from the success of the program) behind a cohesive effort on behalf of plastics.

4. QUICK RESPONSE SYSTEM

Misinformation is beginning to plague the plastics industry to such a degree that it is affecting customer relations. To counteract this, Hill and Knowlton are establishing a quick response system which will provide corrective facts to erroneous information which appear in the media (newspapers, magazines, radio and television).

5. COMMUNICATIONS PROGRAMS

A good defense is not enough, of course. They are also establishing a positive communications program to carry the story of plastics to those segments of the population who are the most influential in determining the future of plastics. By this we mean such groups as:

5A. SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

The solid waste disposal experts who will be involved in initial stages of legislation, whose testimony will be given great weight in legislative hearings, and who will have to live with legislation after it is passed.

5B. LEGISLATORS

Municipal, county and state legislators - as well as those on the federal level - who will often find themselves in lonely positions if they support the

plastics industry's case. They will need fact to counter fiction, case histories to blunt emotion.

- 5C. EDITORS, WRITERS AND COMMENTATORS who often bring a whole series of influences to bear on special groups and the general public.

5D. ENVIRONMENTALISTS

Some frankly can never be persuaded to see two sides of a question but others will listen to, and eventually understand, the intricacies of environmental problem solving.

5E. CIVIC GROUPS

And, of course, we are concerned about communications with taxing authorities, public health officials and the various civic and women's groups which have such an important role to play in community affairs.

6. DEVELOP TAILORED MATERIALS FOR LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVES AND HEARING WITNESSES.

7. GOVERNMENT RELATIONS MANUAL

On the municipal and county levels, it is anticipated that a great deal of the effort will be conducted by the members of the plastics Council and our allies. For this purpose there will be developed a government relations manual with information on procedures, tactics, sample testimony, pitfalls to be avoided, and suggested methods of public relations support.

8. SOLID WASTE PROBLEMS

SPI already has embarked on a program to build a case for the plastics industry through research. This will be expanded by means of pilot demonstration projects, encouragement of individual company research, and support of land fill and incinerator studies which will demonstrate to customers, to influential groups and to the general public, the plastics industry's concern for solutions to solid waste problems.

9. BUILDING CUSTOMER CONFIDENCE

As you already know, you are faced with the critical situation of customer confidence. The entire thrust of the program we have been discussing is designed to reassure our customers that plastics will not be a public relations problem, and to enlist them as allies in the campaign against undue repressive legislation.

10. PRIMARY AUDIENCES

This Plastics Council program is not the type of scattergun publicity show which might make a lot of noise but miss its targets. Rather, it is directed at those special categories of people who can turn community opinion, persuade legislative committees and influence town councils.

That is our Public Affairs Program for 1972, and Hill and Knowlton is certainly capable of handling it. They are a full service public relations agency with offices throughout the world. They offer us direct representation in 28 major metropolitan areas in the United States. They also have Government relations associates in each of the 50 state capitols, and, lastly, they are experienced in this type of work as they represent ten trade associations such as power, transportation, mining, health services and consumer products. We are very confident that they can handle our Public Affairs Program.

The Council meets again next Tuesday, and our agenda will cover such items as:

1. A financial report.
2. Review of the results of our last meeting.
3. Review the purpose of the Council which will have us further define how broad or narrow we choose to be.
4. Investigate a potential change in the name of the Council to possibly include public affairs.
5. Establish our Bylaws.
6. A public relations report.
7. And most importantly, to cover our problems of membership. As I stated, we only have 52 SPI members out of a total of approximately 1,000. Our Membership Committee will come up

with proposals on how we increase the membership in order to increase available funds which will get us into subjects such as: different membership classes; dues schedules; and non-SPI members.

It is very disheartening to know that practically 100% of the Council's activities to date have been centered around plastic containers and that 13 of the 36 Bottle Division members still have not chosen to contribute to this activity which is keeping them in business.

Kenneth G. Michel
Vice President &
General Manager
Plastic Container Division
Continental Can Company

KGMgs-

SPI-24173