

*****PRESS RELEASE*****

Erik Paulsen Launches Negative Attack Ad on Madia
*In Attack Ad, Career Politician Erik Paulsen Promises to
Continue Failed Policies of the Bush Administration*

MAPLE GROVE — Erik Paulsen is now the first candidate in the Third District race to launch a negative attack ad on television. Ashwin Madia's top priority is to balance the budget and pay down the debt. Paulsen's ad promises voters that Paulsen will be a strong supporter of the Bush administration's failed economic policies that that have brought our nation to the financial brink.

Ashwin Madia supports eliminating the Bush tax cut for those making more than \$250,000, so that we can balance the budget and reduce the national debt. With a nearly \$500 billion deficit and a nearly \$10 trillion national debt, Paulsen now proposes borrowing an additional \$2 trillion to finance tax cuts for the wealthy and big corporations.

Erik Paulsen has a very different set of priorities. When Minnesota was facing a mounting \$4 billion deficit, he managed to find the money to raise the salaries of more than 200 well-connected political staffers at the State Capitol. He then rewarded his corporate contributors by voting to allow corporations to evade their Minnesota taxes by setting up phony headquarters off-shore. Meanwhile, he voted to eliminate health coverage for 68,000 Minnesotans, raised fees by \$1,800 on seniors in nursing homes, and even voted to cut tuition assistance for Minnesota National Guard troops returning from Iraq. He also has the distinction of voting to cut education spending for the first time in Minnesota history. Minnesotans want real change in Washington, but Erik Paulsen only promises more of the same.

Madia Campaign Manager Stu Rosenberg said the following:

"It is unfortunate that Erik Paulsen has launched the first negative ad by any candidate in this race. His new attack ad is simply an attempt to hide his own long record of putting the interests of big corporations ahead of middle class families. Minnesotans in the Third District are enthusiastically supporting Ashwin Madia's common sense proposals to balance the budget to get our economy back on track."

Erik Paulsen gave political appointees bonuses the same year that he voted for the biggest education cuts in Minnesota's history. In December 2003, Paulsen gave year-end bonuses of \$1,750 dollars to over 200 political aides in the Minnesota House. [Associated Press, 12/20/03]

This was the same year that Paulsen voted for the biggest education cuts in Minnesota's history. Paulsen voted for a budget that cut education by \$622 million over two years. [HF 51, HJ p. 50, 5/22/03]

It was also the same year Paulsen voted to cut health care coverage for 68,000 Minnesotans. The bill forced middle class Minnesotans to lose their health insurance. The final version of the bill eliminated coverage for 38,000 Minnesotans – the "deepest cuts ... in state history." [HF 437, HJ p. 3321, 5/1/03; Pioneer Press, 5/29/03]

That same year, Erik Paulsen voted for a bill that raised fees on certain seniors in nursing homes by \$1,800 a year, a provision later dubbed as the "granny tax." The FY 2004-05 Health and Human Services budget bill included a new \$1,800 fee increase on private-paying nursing home residents. About 14,000 Minnesota seniors were impacted by the fee increase when it took effect in 2004. [HF 6, H.J. p. 771, 5/29/03; Associated Press, 5/29/03]

On top of everything else, Paulsen even voted for a state golf course over tuition assistance for National Guard Members. In May 2003, Paulsen voted against an amendment requiring the state to sell a 9-hole golf course and use the proceeds to increase tuition reimbursement for members of the National Guard. [SF 1524, HJ, p. 3287, 5/01/03]

Erik Paulsen voted to protect corporations that dodge state taxes by off-shoring. In May 2003, Paulsen voted against an amendment to prevent the state from entering into contracts with companies that locate their corporate headquarters offshore so as to avoid paying taxes in Minnesota. Corporations would have had to demonstrate that it had not located its corporate headquarters in an offshore mailbox just to avoid paying taxes in Minnesota. [Hilty amendment, SF 1524, 83rd Session, House Journal p. 3289, 5/01/03]