

How to sponge off taxpayers, and do it in style

To be honest, cutting off your own foot to maintain handouts from the state sets something of a low point in welfare sponging. But boy, are there some competitors...



Life on welfare...

[Daniel J. Mitchell](#)

On 23 April 2014

About one year ago, I decided to create a “[Moocher Hall of Fame](#)” to highlight how certain people went above and beyond the call of indolence in their efforts to sponge off taxpayers.

This award isn’t for ordinary deadbeats. You have to do something really special (the bad kind of special) to get recognized.

* Like convincing a government to give you “disability” benefits so you can [satisfy your diaper-wearing fetish](#).

* Such as [cutting off your own foot](#) to maintain handouts from the state.

* Or trying to [impregnate 12-year old girls](#) to increase household welfare payments.

* And how about [plotting to kill the people](#) who are subsidizing your laziness.

We have a new candidate for the MHoF.

Or perhaps I should say candidates. Our contestants are a husband and wife who enjoyed a first class lifestyle at taxpayer expense. Here are some passages from [a Fox News report](#).

"A Minnesota couple who allegedly lived in expensive homes and owned a yacht while taking more than \$160,000 in state welfare benefits has been arrested. ...Court documents allege the pair illegally obtained food stamps and other benefits from 2005 to 2012. According to the criminal complaints, over the years, the Chisholms received medical assistance, welfare payments and food stamp benefits...

"..When they first applied for welfare benefits, the couple allegedly listed their residence as Andrea Chisholm's mother's home in Minneapolis. Shortly after getting approved, they moved to Florida, according to court documents. They remained in that state for at least 28 months, first on their \$1.2 million yacht, and then moving to a house, officials said. They collected welfare from Florida, as well as Minnesota during that time, which is prohibited, according to court documents."

So why should the Chisholms win an award?

Well, I thought it was supposed to be difficult for married adults to sponge off taxpayers, particularly if there was an able-bodied male in the household, yet that didn't stop the Chisholms from raking in the cash.

I guess you could consider them to be the older – and American – version of [Danny and Gina](#) (though I don't know if that deadbeat couple is/was married).

But that's not why the Chisholms deserve to be in the MHoF. What caught my attention is that they financed a yacht with welfare payments. That's going above and beyond the call of indolence.

P.S. I have to confess that Mr. Chisholm reminded me of Rand Paul, at least at first glance.



Separated at birth?

Though I feel like apologizing for implying any connection. After all, Senator Paul has been [kind enough to give me credit](#) for jokes I steal from other people. More important, he [defends taxpayers](#).

Whereas Mr. Chisholm likes to steal from taxpayers. That's a big difference.

Daniel J. Mitchell, a long standing contributor to [The Commentator](#), is a Senior Fellow at the [Cato Institute](#), the free-market, Washington D.C. think tank. His articles are cross-posted on his [blog](#) by agreement