

Senate Votes 81, 82, 83, 84

												KEY			
81 82 83 84				81 82 83 84				81 82 83 84							
<b>ALABAMA</b>				<b>IOWA</b>				<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>				Y Voted for (yea). # Paired for. + Announced for. N Voted against (nay). X Paired against. - Announced against. P Voted "present." C Voted "present" to avoid possible conflict of interest. ? Did not vote or otherwise make a position known. Democrats      Republicans			
Heflin	Y	?	Y	N	Harkin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Humphrey	N				
Shelby	Y	Y	Y	N	Grassley	Y	N	N	N	Rudman	Y	N	N	N	
<b>ALASKA</b>				<b>KANSAS</b>				<b>NEW JERSEY</b>							
Murkowski	Y	N	N	N	Dole	N	N	N	N	Bradley	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Stevens	?	N	N	N	Kassebaum	Y	N	?	N	Lautenberg	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>ARIZONA</b>				<b>KENTUCKY</b>				<b>NEW MEXICO</b>							
DeConcini	Y	Y	Y	N	Ford	Y	Y	Y	Y	Bingaman	?	Y	Y	Y	
McCain	?	N	N	N	McConnell	N	N	N	N	Domenici	N	N	N	N	
<b>ARKANSAS</b>				<b>LOUISIANA</b>				<b>NEW YORK</b>							
Bumpers	?	Y	Y	Y	Breaux	Y	Y	Y	Y	Moynihan	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Pryor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Johnston	Y	Y	Y	Y	D'Amato	Y	N	N	N	
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>				<b>MAINE</b>				<b>NORTH CAROLINA</b>							
Cranston	Y	Y	Y	Y	Mitchell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Sanford	?	Y	Y	Y	
Wilson	N	N	N	N	Cohen	Y	N	N	N	Helm	N	N	N	N	
<b>COLORADO</b>				<b>MARYLAND</b>				<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>							
Wirth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Mikulski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Burdick	?	Y	Y	Y	
Armstrong	Y	N	N	N	Sarbanes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Conrad	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>				<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>				<b>OHIO</b>							
Dodd	Y	Y	Y	Y	Kennedy	?	Y	Y	Y	Glenn	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Weicker	Y	N	Y	Y	Kerry	Y	Y	Y	Y	Metzenbaum	Y	Y	Y	Y	
<b>DELAWARE</b>				<b>MICHIGAN</b>				<b>OKLAHOMA</b>							
Biden	?	?	?	Y	Levin	Y	Y	Y	Y	Boren	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Roth	Y	N	N	N	Riegle	Y	Y	Y	Y	Nickles	?	N	N	N	
<b>FLORIDA</b>				<b>MINNESOTA</b>				<b>OREGON</b>							
Chiles	Y	Y	Y	Y	Boschwitz	N	N	N	N	Hatfield	Y	N	N	N	
Graham	Y	Y	Y	Y	Durenberger	Y	N	N	N	Packwood	?	N	N	N	
<b>GEORGIA</b>				<b>MISSISSIPPI</b>				<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>							
Fowler	?	Y	Y	Y	Stennis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Heinz	Y	?	-	N	
Nunn	Y	Y	Y	Y	Cochran	N	N	N	N	Specter	Y	N	N	N	
<b>HAWAII</b>				<b>MISSOURI</b>				<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>							
Inouye	Y	Y	Y	Y	Bond	?	N	N	N	Pell	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Matsunaga	Y	Y	Y	Y	Danforth	Y	N	N	N	Chafee	Y	N	N	N	
<b>IDAHO</b>				<b>MONTANA</b>				<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>							
McClure	?	N	N	N	Baucus	Y	Y	Y	Y	Hollings	Y	Y	N	N	
Symms	?	N	N	N	Melcher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Thurmond	Y	N	N	N	
<b>ILLINOIS</b>				<b>NEBRASKA</b>				<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>							
Dixon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Exon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Daschle	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Simon	?	Y	Y	Y	Karnes	N	N	N	N	Pressler	N	N	N	N	
<b>INDIANA</b>				<b>NEVADA</b>				<b>TENNESSEE</b>							
Lugar	N	N	N	N	Reid	Y	Y	Y	Y	Gore	?	?	?	?	
Quayle	N	N	N	N	Hecht	Y	N	N	N	Sasser	Y	Y	Y	Y	

ND - Northern Democrats    SD - Southern Democrats (Southern states - Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N.C., Okla., S.C., Tenn., Texas, Va.)

**81. Crigler Nomination.** Confirmation of President Reagan's nomination of Truett Frank Crigler of Virginia to be ambassador to the Somali Democratic Republic. Confirmed 65-14: R 20-14; D 45-0 (ND 31-0, SD 14-0), April 24, 1987. A "yea" was a vote supporting the president's position.

**82. S Con Res 49. Fiscal 1988 Budget Resolution/ "Sequester" Budget.** Byrd, D-W.Va., motion to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution to set fiscal 1988 budget totals as follows: new budget authority, \$1.082 trillion; outlays, \$1.009 trillion; revenues, \$901 billion; deficit, \$108 billion. (This so-called sequester budget, as calculated by the Congressional Budget Office, incorporates across-the-board spending reductions needed to reach the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target of \$108 billion.) Motion agreed to 51-45: R 0-45; D 51-0 (ND 35-0, SD 16-0), April 28, 1987.

**83. S Con Res 49. Fiscal 1988 Budget Resolution/Domenici Objection.** Chiles, D-Fla., motion to table (kill) the Domenici, R-N.M., motion to appeal the ruling of the chair that the Chiles amendment (S Con Res 48) was in order. (S Con Res 48, an amendment offered to S Con Res 49 (see vote above), was a Chiles-drafted fiscal 1988 budget resolution. It specified that, for pur-

poses of determining whether it complied with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings deficit target, the economic assumptions from President Reagan's fiscal 1988 budget should be used. The assumptions were drawn up by the Office of Management and Budget.) Motion agreed to 50-46: R 1-43; D 49-3 (ND 33-2, SD 16-1), April 28, 1987.

**84. S Con Res 49. Fiscal 1988 Budget Resolution/Chiles Budget.** Chiles, D-Fla., perfecting amendment to the Chiles amendment to the Byrd, D-W.Va., motion to recommit the concurrent resolution to the Budget Committee with instructions. (The parliamentary structure of amendments and motions is called an "amendment tree." It is designed to block other amendments temporarily.) The Chiles amendment would set fiscal 1988 budget totals as follows: new budget authority, \$1.158 trillion; outlays, \$1.053 trillion; revenues, \$919 billion; deficit, \$133.7 billion. The deficit figure shown is as calculated by the Congressional Budget Office; however, this amendment includes a requirement that, to determine compliance with the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings 1988 deficit target (\$108 billion), economic assumptions drawn up by the Office of Management and Budget would be used. No recalculated deficit figure was available when the Senate voted. Adopted 50-49: R 1-45; D 49-4 (ND 35-1, SD 14-3), April 29, 1987.