

Excerpts from Letters and Articles Against No-Kill Shelters and The Adoption Pact*

Untrue Accusation

1. No-Kills lie and deceive the public.

"The majority of no-kill shelters engage in the practice of public deception to some degree, lulling their communities into a false sense of security and garnering support through false pretenses."

— Pat Miller, Operations Director, Marin Humane Society.
"No-kill..." or "You-Kill?" C.H.A.I.N. Letter, Fall, 1991.

"The fact is that most of these groups are simply attempting to 'cure cancer with a band-aid' at best or are blatant 'con artist rip-offs' at worst!"

—Bill Garrett, Executive Director, Atlanta Humane Society.
Sorry, We Don't have Any Room. The Heart, Spring, 1994.

2. The Adoption Pact is a "gimmick" and "hype."

"So what is the big fuss...? Could this proposed Adoption Act be a clever, fundraising gimmick for the San Francisco SPCA?"

—Edward C. Cubrda, President and CEO, Los Angeles SPCA.
Letter To San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission, October 15, 1993.

"The 'hype' of 'turn your animal in - we'll find it a home' is an unrealistic expectation."

—Deborah L. Biggs, President, California Animal Control Directors' Association. *Letter to the San Francisco Animal Control and Welfare Commission*, October 12, 1993.

3. No-Kills are callous, uncaring, greedy, selfish, and accountable to no one.

"[No kills] turn their backs on the outcasts...."

— Pat Miller, Operations Director, Marin Humane Society.
"No-kill..." or "You-Kill?" C.H.A.I.N. Letter, Fall, 1991.

"[M]any of the so-called 'no-kill' shelters...simply slam[] the door in the pet owner's face. (Unfortunately in many cases that door can be re-opened when the pet owner makes a sizeable monetary gift!).... Many are governed only by themselves or immediate family and by self-interest."

—Bill Garrett, Executive Director, Atlanta Humane Society.
Sorry, We Don't have Any Room. The Heart, Spring, 1994

Untrue Accusation

Example

4. Under the Adoption Pact, The San Francisco SPCA can pick the cream-of-the-crop and reject any animal it wants to.

“Given the numbers of homeless animals in both San Francisco and San Mateo counties—and throughout the country—the only way that a shelter can escape dealing with euthanasia is to.... (1) pre-screen[] homeless animals and/or those being surrendered by their owners to select only those with the greatest potential for easy adoption and turn[] the rest away, or (2) refus[e] any new animals when the shelter and available foster homes are full, or (3) a combination of both approaches.”

—Kathleen Savesky, Executive Director, Peninsula Humane Society. Letter to SF/SPCA Member, May 25, 1995.

5. No-Kills let animals suffer unnecessarily and kill them in secret.

“Some no-kill shelters...transport[] animals to other agencies that do provide euthanasia services. Others simply ‘allow an animal to suffer unnecessarily’ rather than accepting the responsibility of easing the animal’s misery through a painless injection. Still others kill animals surreptitiously, behind closed doors, and hope their supporters never find out...”

—Pat Miller, Operations Director, Marin Humane Society. “No-Kill”... or “You Kill?” C.H.A.I.N. Letter. Fall, 1991.

6. The Adoption Pact is dangerous and arbitrary.

“Although it also may be true that our neighboring community will be able to guarantee placement of all ‘adoptable’ animals—as could many other organizations if they chose to make such distinctions—there are many potential dangers in making guarantees based on an approach that involves arbitrary distinctions....”

—Kathleen Savesky, Executive Director, Peninsula Humane Society. Pawprint. Summer 1994.

* Complete text of quoted materials available on request.