of them: the social odium which attaches to a filing, if such there is, attaches to both proceedings.

Outlawing commercial debt management is not the answer. It is, in the cliche, throwing out the baby with the bath. It is this simple: creditors want their money, and properly regulated debt management companies can help them get it. At the same time, and first and foremost, they can help debtors get out of debt without recourse to the courts and without repudiating their creditors. I see nothing *malum in se* in this: on the contrary, I see private enterprise offering drowning debtors a viable alternative to bankruptcy.

H.R. 9806 would exempt lawyers who incidental to the practice of law act to adjust the debts of clients. I suppose this is an admission that debt-adjustment is not *malum in se* and an admission, even, that it is an inevitable and ethical practice.

As far as exempting non-profit or charitable corporations from the prohibitions is concerned, I submit to you that there is no less need for regulation of such corporations than there is for regulation of profit-making concerns. The money comes from somewhere, and it is spent by people. What ever happened to the Sister Kennedy Foundation?

In closing, let me say this: I have had cause to familiarize myself thoroughly with the debt management concept and its implementation by private enterprise. I am convinced of its social utility. The consumer is cajoled, enticed, solicited and pressured into debt from every point on the social compass. No law prohibits him from buying what he can't pay for. No odium attaches to the retailer who sells it to him. If private enterprise can offer him an alternative to bankruptcy, why shouldn't it be legitimized instead of forbidden?

Congress has it within its power to protect the consumer-debtor by regulation, such as H.R. 9829, introduced by Congressman Diggs, and to provide him with a service that permits him to meet his obligations instead of denying them. I submit that prohibition of commercial debt-management companies is nothing more than an additional recommendation for bankruptcy.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Holland, without objection, your statement will be made a part of the record. You may proceed to read your statement or make an oral statement, whichever you prefer.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before this Subcommittee on H.R. 8929 and H.R. 9806. My name is Elliott Holland, and I am the General Manager of the Barden group of companies. We operate 56 debt counselling offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere throughout the country under the Credit Advisors and other trade names. I hope my testimony can show this Subcommittee how professional debt counsellors help so many people bogged down in debt. I testify from daily experience in this industry. We know from working with thousands of debtors that they need our services and that they obtain a practical course in financial planning as we help them out of debt. Our actual experience disproves the many unfounded charges made against the debt management industry.

I had planned on going through my prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, but I would like first to cover a few of its main points and to cover a few of the unfounded statements that were made yesterday during the hearings, especially those that deal with a description. There were certain errors and inaccuracies in describing our clients and ourselves.

I look at our debt management client as my boss. I work for him. I am taking his attitude toward his debt and if I can successfully help him out of debt, then I have done my job. If I cannot, then I feel that I have failed him and we try not to fail any of our clients.

Our client yesterday was described as being poor and uneducated. I would just like to disabuse the committee of this feeling. Our average client is a wage earner and he has had an average of almost