



H.R. 1 FACT CHECK: EMAIL INVENTS FALSE CLAIMS ABOUT “SECOND SALARY”

A falsehood-filled mass email to Congressional offices — a [campaign organized by a controversial hate group](#) — claims H.R. 1 will use taxpayer money to pay Members of Congress a “second salary worth as much as \$600,000 per year (based on CBO estimates).”

This is a complete fiction.

H.R. 1 WOULD NOT ALLOW OFFICEHOLDERS TO DRAW A SECOND SALARY.

- Existing law allows candidates who are not incumbents to [receive a limited salary](#) from their campaign funds. This longstanding provision — *which H.R. 1 would not change* — allows candidates who are not independently wealthy to run for office. It does not permit campaign salary payments to sitting Members of Congress.

THERE IS NO “\$600,000” CANDIDATE SALARY.

- Existing law caps the permissible candidate salary at the congressional salary of the office the candidate is seeking, so around \$174,000 per year. H.R. 1 would not change this limit.

THERE IS NO “CBO ESTIMATE” SHOWING A \$600,000 CANDIDATE SALARY.

- This simply does not exist.

CHILDCARE AND HEALTHCARE PAYMENTS ARE DEDUCTED FROM A CANDIDATE SALARY

- H.R. 1 allows non-incumbent candidates to use campaign funds for childcare and health insurance premiums, but requires any such payments to be deducted from the candidate’s campaign salary. H.R. 1 also prohibits the candidate’s childcare expenses and insurance premiums from exceeding the \$174,000 salary limit. This limitation on childcare and healthcare expenditures is the only mention of candidate salaries in H.R. 1. (*See Sections 5301-02.*)

NO TAXPAYER MONEY CAN BE USED TO PAY CANDIDATE SALARIES OF ANY AMOUNT.

- H.R. 1’s optional small-donor matching program is not financed by taxpayers. Instead, the funds used for the small-donor matches come from a small surcharge on certain criminal fines and penalties paid to the government.