

would not be bad if the philosophy of granting house arrests were the only matter. But when we have a particular company with a particular device interested in the program, so their device can be sold, I think it's something the Legislature needs to consider very, very carefully, not just because the company wants to sell its device, but whether or not that type of device is demeaning. Because somebody has been convicted of a crime doesn't mean they should be demeaned in the process of society wreaking some kind of retribution from them. There could be a situation where a person might say rather than wear that, I'll serve the time, and they say very good. If you don't want to be degraded in this fashion, you stay in jail. I don't think a person should be confronted with that type of choice. If we believe that, because jails are overcrowded, there should be house arrest, the issues should be discussed on the basis of justifying house arrest as a program, and I agree with it. Next, if you're going to talk about monitoring people electronically, I'm the one who opposed requiring a person to have a device attached to them. This bill was brought to us by Sarpy County, because they have a specific device that they attach to people and the judge was unsure whether or not he could order that in view of the fact that there is no statutory authorization. So the bill is drafted in general terms, but there is a specific device in mind. I'd like to ask Senator Pirsch a question.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Pirsch, will you yield to a question?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yes, I will.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Chambers, you may proceed.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is it true that the moving force behind this bill was Sarpy County, or the judge in Sarpy County?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Judge Reagar has found this to be a very satisfactory alternative to jail sentences.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Is he a judge in Sarpy County?

SENATOR PIRSCH: Yes, he is.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And he was the moving force behind the bill.

SENATOR PIRSCH: Absolutely.