of the business was not effective or they found that it was administratively burdensome, or both.

A state that once tried to regulate the business of debt adjusting found it necessary, in something like 25.5 months, to enact legislation prohibiting it.

Perhaps representatives of the business here today can explain why Rhode Island did that, but I find it very interesting.

I have nothing more, Mr. Chairman, unless there are some questions.

Mr. SISK. Thank you, Mr. Kneipp. I understand from your statement that the Commissioners support the Broyhill bill? Is that correct?

Mr. KNEIPP. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SISK. I believe you mentioned Chapter 13 in relation to the question raised by our colleague from North Carolina. The bill might require some revision or possibly a new section. As I understand your comments, you indicate that that is possibly a unique feature in that bill.

Mr. KNEIPP. I will discuss the question with Mr. Zelenko of the Judiciary Committee, and I will make known to the staff what might have to be done in this regard.

Mr. SISK. Based on some of my own experiences, I have one question, Mr. Kneipp, that concerns me. Also, I think it would concern most people who have had contact with a variety of people over a period of years.

Was your statement of the reasons why the District Commissioners have not found it advisable to go ahead and use existing authority to regulate the business of debt adjusting, based on the fact that it was their feeling no need existed for it.

Mr. KNEIPP. No, Mr. Chairman. That there is no economic justification for this. I think by that they mean with regard to the matter of charging for this service—I think everyone recognizes a person in debt may need some guidance and for this reason the bill does provide that it shall not be applicable to the non-profit type of budget counselling service, but it is the lack of economic justification. This business of increasing the total debt by 15, perhaps to as high as 25 per cent—although on the average it may not be that much, but the result of increasing the debt of an already insolvent group of people seems to have little economic justification. Certainly they may need help in managing their debts, but they don't need help that just shoves them further into debt, and this is the basis——

Mr. SISK. If I can clarify the intent of my question based on what I understood you to say. Let's say that in the morning a gentleman comes into my office. He has debt problems and has reached the end of the line, so to speak. I am referring to a situation where a man becomes so burdened down through mismanagement, or being "gullible," that he finds himself with a variety of bills which he simply cannot pay. In this case, to whom should I send him in the District of Columbia?

I think it is fine if this service was on a non-profit basis and free of charge to the public. Is such an organization, or are such services available in the District of Columbia? Are you advocating that it should be a taxpayer-supported institution?