

sampling and enumeration. That costs more money. No one anticipated that three years ago, especially the administration, because they didn't think the Court was going to rule against them. So although the census has been going on for 200 years, this battle is a very real current one, over a constitutional interpretation. And that was only given in January or February. So the budget had already been determined, and the Census Bureau needs more money than it had originally anticipated because it was only going to do the Clinton way, and the Court said you can't do it just the Clinton way. They could have conceded and done enumeration, but they didn't.

Now, is that an "emergency?" It is a current need imposed by outside forces—the Supreme Court—on the current budgetary process, which cannot be accounted for under the current budget process. I mean, that kind of meets the definition of an emergency. Although it's dealing with something that's been done all along, it simply wasn't accounted for. I think that makes sense. Now, take a look at most of these disaster bills, which you know... Here's a hurricane, well fine, let's do a little bit of disaster aid for this. But you take a look at what's added to it. The emergency aid is the engine, but then boxcar after boxcar of other expenditures are added to it. It gets pretty far out, pretty fast, as to whether these "boxcars" are emergencies or not. It's the engine that's pulling it.

That, I think, is the greatest misuse of emergency funding: where you take a real emergency and then wrap it with all this other stuff that is desirable, but is truly not

an emergency, and would have a difficult time funding itself in the regular budget process because there you play priorities and these always such low priorities they never make it. Now, when you look at the total amount of money that's involved in this, it truly is not that significant. It's getting bigger, and so you have to watch it. Any of this fiscal stuff over time is a quantity determination. There has to be some decent system to get accommodation and compromise. That's always been the American way.

To a certain extent, that's what this emergency funding is doing. It's putting a little grease in the system so you can go forward. Is it the best way to grease it? Of course not. You've got to go to the joint, and put it in right where the joint is supposed to be greased. Now, can you slap it all around it and pack it? Sure, but that's a waste. Almost always when you try to deal with these, you end up with a lot of waste, which is an inefficient way of doing things. But politics sometimes, to someone's view of what's going on, is a big waste. But if you compare the amount of money that gets all these committee people on board - you know, \$5 million, \$10 million, \$50 million, \$100 million—and then they pass a \$400 billion package that otherwise wouldn't have passed, if they didn't get these hokey little things that got them to say yes, then you've got to weigh the percentages. I mean, that's just the way Congress has always worked.

Interview conducted by Ann Strohn and Matthew Taylor.

Bill Thomas, Republican of Bakersfield, California, represents over 585,000 people in California's Twenty-first Congressional District. He serves on the House Ways and Means Committee and is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health. In 1998, Thomas was appointed administrative chairman of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. He is also a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, where he works for California's trade interests. Thomas is the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. Throughout his career, Thomas has been recognized for his legislative efforts to eliminate the federal deficit. The congressman graduated from Santa Ana Community College and obtained both his bachelor's and masters degrees from San Francisco State University.

The Effect of Private Education on Political Participation, Social Capital and Tolerance: An Examination of the Latino National Political Survey

JAY P. GREENE, JOSEPH GIAMMO AND NICOLE MELLOW
University of Texas at Austin

Considerable research exists to demonstrate that the amount of education that people receive is strongly related to the political attitudes and behaviors they display. People with more years of formal education tend to be more politically active, possess higher levels of social capital and demonstrate greater levels of tolerance. Little empirical research exists, however, on whether different types of education, such as public or private schooling, have significantly different effects on these civic outcomes. In this article we examine the effect of public and private education on these civic values among a nationally representative sample of Latinos, as measured in the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS). Given that the dissemination of basic, desirable civic values is thought to be particularly important for immigrant populations, focusing on Latinos, of whom a disproportionate number are immigrants, is particularly relevant. After controlling for a variety of factors, the findings of our analyses are that private education contributes to higher levels of political participation, social capital and tolerance than does public education.

INTRODUCTION

Considerable research exists to demonstrate that the amount of education that people receive is strongly related to the political attitudes and behaviors they display. People with more years of formal education tend to be more politically active, possess higher levels of social capital and demonstrate greater levels of tolerance (Nie 1996; Verba 1995; Putnam 1995). Little empirical research exists, however, on whether different types of education, such as public or private schooling, have significantly different effects on these outcomes. To be sure, the US system of public education was developed with the belief that gov-

ernment-operated public schools are essential for the development of future generations of citizens possessing certain basic, desirable civic values. But the need for government operation of schools has been largely a matter of faith and has not been subjected to much systematic, empirical analysis.

In this article we examine the effect of public and private education on civic values among a nationally representative sample of Latinos, as measured in the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS).¹ Given that the dissemination of basic, desirable civic values is thought to be particularly important for immigrant populations, focusing on Latinos, of

AUTHOR'S NOTE: The authors wish to thank Rudy de la Garza and the Public Policy Clinic of the Government Department at the University of Texas at Austin for their assistance in conducting this research. Additional research assistance was provided by Jongho Lee.