people are aware of the fact that on April 24, 2007, the United States collected a record setting $48.7 billion in tax receipts. I think these numbers are certainly worth our attention.

What I find so interesting about these record-breaking tax revenues is the fact they were achieved without raising taxes and without a Federal budget in place. Rather, the American economy is the driving force behind these windfalls. I would pose the question that maybe; just maybe, we should maintain the status quo instead of entering into the budget resolution that is being proposed.

I think Congress should think long and hard about these numbers before we consider making any change to current budget policy. Because of these record tax revenues the budget deficit could be slashed in more than half from this same time last year. The deficit could be reduced by $150 billion this year, which equates to approximately 1 percent of gross domestic product. I believe our current budget policy is paying off and in the next 18 to 24 months the deficit could completely disappear, if we here in Congress do not veer off course.

I am not surprised that we are collecting nearly 30 percent more from nonwithheld income. Moreover, I also do not find it surprising that individual income tax receipts are up by almost 17.5 percent. I believe that the tax relief that we instituted in 2001 and 2003 is paying large dividends and our economy is benefiting.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will consider these facts and not attempt to fix something that is not broken. I am simply saying that maybe we should not be rushed into action.

Additionally, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL REVENUE SHOWER

Here's the ''surge'' you aren't reading about: the continuing flood of tax revenue into the federal Treasury. Tax receipts for April were $70 billion above the same month in 2006, and April 24 marked the single biggest day of tax collections in U.S. history, at $48.7 billion, according to the latest Treasury report.

The April comparison is slightly askew because the IRS processed more returns than usual this year. But there's no denying that Americans are sending more money than ever to Washington; revenues for the first seven months of fiscal 2007 are up 11.3%, or $153 billion. This Beltway bonanza has helped to slash the projected federal budget deficit by more than half from the same point last year. Across the past three Aprils, federal red ink has sunk by nearly $300 billion. The deficit this year could tumble to $150 billion, or an economically trivial 1% of GDP.

This revenue boom certainly casts doubt on the political walls about tax loopholes for the rich. So far this year, the taxes paid on so-called nonwithheld income, which are dollars that don't come from normal wages and salaries, have climbed by nearly 30%. This is income largely derived from capital gains, dividends and other investment sources—i.e., the tax rates that President Bush cut in 2003. Individual income taxes are also up by 17.5%—a handsome fiscal dividend from rising wages and low unemployment.

In other good news, the pace of federal spending, which was pedal-to-the-metal in Mr. Bush's first term, has finally decelerated. So far this year federal outlays have climbed by 3%, and, save for Medicare and Medicaid, federal expenditures are nearly flat from 2006. Spending will climb again once the Iraq supplemental passes, and revenues can't keep rising at a double digit pace forever.

Still, you'd think this dramatic fiscal turnaround would cheer up Capitol Hill. Instead, Congressional Democrats seem to live in a parallel universe—one that they claim is starved for revenues, with a runaway deficit, and is dominated by the rich who pay no taxes at all. The reality is that the wealthy are financing Democratic spending ambitions, and the deficit could easily vanish within a year or two if Congress has the good sense to leave current tax policy in place.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I wish today, on National Police Week, to honor this Nation's law enforcement officers. Our law enforcement officers are some of the bravest men and women we will ever come across. They selflessly dedicate their lives to keeping our communities safe and taking dangerous individuals off our streets.

Tragically, some of those officers lose their lives while on duty. The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial currently bears the names of more than 17,500 officers who have been killed or died while on duty. This week, 382 additional names will be added. Two of those fallen officers are from my home State of Wisconsin.

Jackie Ryden dedicated his life to law enforcement, spending 33 years with the Ellsworth Police Department, the Pierce County Sheriff's Department, and the Prescott Police Department. He was a well-liked and well-respected member of the police force, as well as his community.

On September 2, 2006, Jackie responded to a natural gas explosion and the resulting fire. He helped to evacuate a number of local citizens from their homes. Shortly after Officer Ryden returned to his patrol car to help direct traffic, he suffered a heart attack and died. According to those who knew him best, he passed away doing what he loved best—serving and protecting his community. Jackie Ryden is survived by his wife, two children, and three grandchildren.

The second officer whom I seek to honor today is Stephen Hahn. Stephen was a special deputy with the Eau Claire County Sheriff's Office, serving approximately 40 years in law enforcement. Mr. Hahn was killed in a traffic accident while transporting an inmate. A vehicle heading in the opposite direction lost control and struck the van being driven by Deputy Hahn. He is survived by his wife and two children.

We mourn the loss of these two great, brave men and attempt to honor them by recognizing the sacrifices they made for the benefit of others. Both of their communities, and the State of Wisconsin as a whole, are worse off because of the loss of these two public safety officers. I am pleased, however, that their names are being added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, so they can forever be remembered for their hard work and dedication to improving the lives of those around them.

VOTE EXPLANATIONS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I regret that on May 15 I was unable to vote on certain provisions of H.R. 1495, the Water Resources Development Act of 2007. I wish to address these votes, so that the people of the great State of Kansas, who elected me to serve them as U.S. Senator, may know my position.

Regarding vote No. 163, on amendment No. 1090, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 164, on amendment No. 1089, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 165, on amendment No. 1086, I would have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Regarding vote No. 166, on amendment No. 1094, I would not have voted in favor of this amendment. My vote would not have altered the final result of this vote.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I missed today's votes on Iraq because I was attending the college graduation of my daughter, Elizabeth.

But I want to express my unqualified support for the amendment offered by my colleagues, Senator FEINGOLD and Senator REID.

This amendment says that our entanglement in another country's civil war has gone on long enough.

This amendment says that Congress must stop playing the role of spectator and start standing up for our overtaxed and inadequately protected troops.

This amendment says we must stand up for their families.

This amendment says that we have an obligation to support our men and women in uniform, not only by funding them, but by bringing them home.

The funding for our troops is assured, whether they are deployed in Iraq or redeployed from Iraq.

This amendment calls for their redeployment.

Those who claim this amendment would cut off funding for our troops are actually saying that the President, if required to redeploy our troops, would instead cut off their funding.

I may not see eye to eye with our President, but I don't believe him capable of that.