

Ewa HANUSZ¹, Ewa M. SKIBNIEWSKA², Michał SKIBNIEWSKI³

HANDLING OF STRAY DOGS IN THE POLISH LANDS FROM THE 19TH TO THE 21ST CENTURY WITH CONSIDERATION OF IRREGULARITIES IN THIS AREA

¹ District Veterinary Inspectorate, Kłodzka 12, 57-500 Bystrzyca Kłodzka, Poland

² Department of Biology of Animal Environment, Institute of Animal Science, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland

³ Department of Morphological Sciences, Institute of Veterinary Medicine, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Poland

Abstract. Domestic animal homelessness is a long-known and ever-present phenomenon in Poland. Left unattended, animals pose a threat to people, their farms, public order and epidemiological safety. “The problem” was attempted to solve as early as the 19th century. Although the main purpose behind catching stray dogs was the need to remove them from public space, attention was drawn already in distant times to issues related to improper and brutal handling during the catching, transporting, keeping and killing of unwanted pets. Nowadays, animals entering shelters can no longer be killed, but the problem of their homelessness is still present and has not been effectively resolved over the years. Changes in the political system and regulations have not guaranteed that they are properly protected and cared for in shelters, as there are still cases of inhumane treatment of animals in these facilities. There have also been no effective solutions to significantly reduce the scale of the phenomenon of dog abandonment in Poland. The lack of an obligation to sterilize mixed-breed individuals means that there are a lot of them, so that any person can come into possession of a dog without any difficulty, which, combined with the lack of mandatory, permanent and enabling owner identification marking, means that there are still tens of thousands of stray dogs in Poland, and responsibility for their abandonment can easily be avoided. The aim of the study is to showcase changes in the treatment of stray animals that occurred during the last century.

Key words: dogs, animal homelessness, shelter, welfare.

SOLVING THE ISSUE OF LOITERING ANIMALS THROUGH URBAN TORTURERS

The need to rid cities of stray animals left unattended was realized in the 19th and 20th centuries through city workers, known as dog catchers or “urban torturers”. They were supposed to catch, transport and detain animals roaming around the city in enclosures known as pounds, and after a certain period of time eliminate them. The word “torturer” itself, meaning “one who tortures or murders someone on someone else’s orders”, although undoubtedly negatively characterized,

Corresponding author: Ewa Skibniewska, Department of Biology of Animal Environment, Institute of Animal Science, Warsaw University of Life Sciences, Jana Ciszewskiego 8, 02-786 Warsaw, Poland, e-mail: ewa_skibniewska@sggw.edu.pl.

appeared in official city documents of the time. Guidelines for dog catchers were issued by city authorities in the form of written instructions or regulations, and the points contained therein included the species of animals, the time and place where they were caught, and the conditions of transport and stay in the pound. For example, in Bochnia, dog catching was to take place in the morning every working day in city squares and streets. The torturer was to capture wandering dogs, especially individuals not equipped with tax stamps and with symptoms of rabies, and then transport them to the pound, where the animals were put to death after a three-day stay. The documentation noted that the animals should be captured in a humane manner. The penalty for unnecessarily tormenting a captured dog was 6 hours to 2 days in jail or a fine. Captured animals were transported by horse-drawn cart, in specially designed compartments. The dogs were then placed in cages on the premises of the pound (Archiwum 1892).

The handling of stray dogs also proceeded according to very similar principles in other cities, such as Lublin and Jarosław. Of course, other wandering animals, such as cats, horses, cattle, pigs, sheep and goats were also to be caught. In addition, the torturers were to take animals sick with contagious diseases and remove dead animals from the city. It was forbidden to drag dogs across the street on a string and to torment or kill them at the point of capture. Wandering dogs were considered to be individuals that wandered around the city and had no or outdated city tags. Lublin and Jarosław torturers, after keeping for three days a dog for which no one came forward, were allowed to keep the skin of the killed animal for themselves (Archiwum 1928, 1936). In fact, the actions of the dog catchers were sometimes criticized by citizens and animal welfare organizations. They were accused of bestiality, inhumane behavior in capturing, transporting, keeping and killing animals. In the 19th century, protection for homeless animals was to be provided by the establishment of charitable institutions known as animal shelters or asylums (Kaliski 2012).

IMPROPER HANDLING OF ANIMALS

The inadequate handling of animals was the cause of complaints to officials about city torturers, which were reported more than once. In 1877, representatives of the Krakow Association for the Protection of Animals addressed the Magistrate with demands that Krakow's dog capturer use a net instead of a rope when capturing dogs, and keep them in clean, padded enclosures with access to water and food without the possibility of contact with dead animals. They also demanded that dogs not be caught during the hours when youngsters are going to or returning from school. The association found many irregularities, for example, that the dogs were kept in scandalous conditions in two cages set up in an unlit building. As many as 10 small and medium-sized dogs were sometimes kept in a cage measuring less than a meter in length and half a meter in width and height. As early as 1879, it was pointed out that a solution to the above issues could be the establishment of a shelter in a clean and tidy building for dogs only, with an appropriately paid employee to properly maintain the animals and feed and water them properly. In addition, they will not be exposed to proximity to the carcasses of other dogs or horses. The complainants pointed to the continuity of the cruel practices that the dog catchers used in dealing with animals, from their methods of capture, detention to killing. Above all, they advocated that the method of killing dogs, which were then killed with a baton, should be changed. In 1878, at an international congress of animal protection societies in Paris, this way of killing animals was considered barbaric. A far more humane method, the so-called American way, which involved drugging animals with carbon monoxide, was put forward as a counter to it. However, in spite of this, the Sanitary Commission, in laying out the new regulations, did not take into account either the demand for the establishment of shelters or the killing of dogs with gas (Krakowskie Stowarzyszenie Ochrony Zwierząt 1887). The Society for the Care of Animals

(TOZ), an organization that was tasked with promoting the proper handling of animals was founded on November 1, 1864. Above all, it was to protect animals and ensure that they were properly cared for. According to the records from 1948 kept by its members, it appears that one of Lodz's urban torturers was characterized by particular cruelty and exceptional brutality towards homeless animals. The dogs he caught were placed in the yard in cages stacked on top of each other. The animals were thus not provided with proper protection from adverse weather conditions. Then, according to the law, they were killed. However, the process of killing stray dogs was very controversial, because after they were brought into the shed, they were set over a blood drain, and then hit with a baton and pierced with a knife. The skins of killed individuals were also stored in the same shed (Archiwum 1948).

Based on existing information, it can be concluded that absolutely no care was taken to possibly minimize the stress of the dogs during their "elimination". On the contrary, the conditions under which the animals were killed caused them suffering not only physically, due to the killing method itself, but also mentally. There was tremendous stress caused by the presence of blood in the area and the dead bodies of previously killed animals.

The infamous practices were also indulged in by dog catchers from other cities, including Jelenia Góra. In 1950, city residents complained about them. In order to make a profit from the sale of dog skins and fat, they stole animals, which they later brutally killed with batons and axes. It was possible to buy back the animal, but this involved incurring high costs. Residents reported that dogs that did not have up-to-date rabies vaccinations were forcibly taken from their apartments and homes. The torturers transported them in tied bags to their headquarters and then kill them. There were reports indicating that no less than 200 dogs were killed in the above manner in just one week. The dog catchers were particularly interested in purebred, clean and well-groomed dogs (Archiwum 1950).

In 1958, as a result of the licensing of small business, the work of dog catchers was restricted to the removal of fallen animals only. The office of the city worker, which dealt with the trapping and killing of homeless animals, was abolished. At times, other facilities were established to take care of homeless animals in place of the earlier pounds. Not all of them operated properly. In the dog asylum operating in Bytom in 1960, serious deficiencies were found. The animals were not provided with proper living conditions, moreover, the meat from the allocation for them was taken by the caretaker and his family (Jarosz 2019). In some cities, the devastated premises of previous pounds were handed over to TOZs, among others, to run shelters for stray animals (Schronisko w Poznaniu). Stray animals were killed not only in so-called pounds. The shooting of dogs and cats was also carried out by hunters, officially as part of the protection of small game from attacks by loitering animals. Controversial ways of dealing with loitering dogs gave rise to the so-called "dog campaign".

A discussion in the 1960s between officials, representatives of organizations that care for animals, hunters, publicists, as well as "ordinary people" regarding this problem contributed to the development of regulations in 1961–1962 to ensure that stray animals would be treated better than before (Jarosz 2019).

ANIMAL SHELTERS IN THE 20–21ST CENTURY

The first animal shelter built from scratch was established in Poznań. It was opened on June 1, 1964 (Schronisko w Poznaniu). Those were the times when the issues of stray animals continued to be solved by their rapid elimination. Guidelines in this regard were contained in Circular Letter No. 48 of the Minister of Municipal Affairs dated October 3, 1961, on the regulation of stray dogs and cats in urban areas. The document contained general guidelines and recommendations for catching, keeping and killing dogs and cats in shelters. Animals left unattended

were considered stray dogs and cats. In cities where there was an Animal Welfare Society, matters related to stray animals were outsourced to their representatives. In the absence of representation in a particular locality, these tasks were carried out by employees of the city's cleaning facilities. As agreed, dogs were to be euthanized after a 14-day stay in the shelter, cats unconditionally after a 5-day stay. At the request and expense of the TOZ, it was possible to extend the stay of dogs in the shelter for another two weeks, provided there was space available in the facility. Purebred dogs were treated somewhat more leniently, the stay of which had to be notified to the Kennel Club appropriate to the breed or the Polish Hunting Association, with a request to search for a person willing to adopt, if the current owner was not found. Such a clear differentiation of the further fate of dogs, depending on their origin, was probably related to financial issues, in which material and breeding value was prioritized over ethical and moral aspects. Despite the fact that the concept of "adoption of a dog", so widely used today, did not appear at the time, the existing records show that such a solution was already provided for at the time, although only for purebred animals. According to the regulations in force in cities, the Department of Public Utilities and Housing was responsible for the infrastructure of shelters, among others, supplying the area with electricity, connecting it to the sewage system, and heating the premises during the cold season. Animals were to be brought to the shelters mainly by the public. To this end, a massive propaganda campaign was also carried out on the radio, in the press and on television. Public participation in reducing dog homelessness, however, did not exclude their capture by shelter workers. They were to handle the animals humanely, but stray animals continued to be killed in large numbers (Pismo Okólne 1961). The legal solution introduced was primarily to keep cities clean. This was, moreover, in line with the then-prevailing Ordinance of the President of the Republic of Poland on the Protection of Animals of March 22, 1928, which prohibited animal abuse, but did not prohibit the mass killing of healthy but abandoned animals in shelters (Rozporządzenie 1928).

The Law on Maintaining Cleanliness and Order in Municipalities of September 13, 1996 also extended to municipalities the obligation to organize protection against stray animals (Ustawa 1996). It was not until the coming into force of the Law of September 21, 1997 on the Protection of Animals, recognizing explicit dereification, i.e. the claim that an animal is not a thing, that the indiscriminate killing of animals was prohibited with certain exceptions. Under the restrictions put in place, stray pets were allowed to stay in shelters indefinitely, and their lives were considered a legally protected good. An exception to the ban on killing healthy animals in shelters is the euthanasia of blind litters (Ustawa 1997).

According to the current definition, an animal shelter is a place intended for the care of domestic animals, meeting the conditions set forth in the Law of March 11, 2004 on the Protection of Animal Health and Control of Infectious Diseases (Ustawa 2004). According to the regulations, only facilities operating as registered shelters may accept stray animals. In practice, "animal huts", "asylums and hotels for animals" operating in this way, which are not entities registered to care for stray animals, operate illegally.

Preventing animal homelessness is the responsibility of municipalities, contracting interested parties to catch and place in shelters stray animals that have been abandoned, escaped or lost their keepers. Animals mainly end up in shelters in this way, rarely being surrendered there by people (Fiszdon and Boruta 2014). The facilities also receive dogs taken from their previous owners.

The very establishment of a shelter formally is not particularly difficult. It is enough to obtain a permit to conduct such activities in the locally competent municipality (does not apply to municipal organizational units). It is also necessary to notify the appropriate Veterinary Inspectorate of the intention to run it. Relating to shelters, the veterinary requirements for the control of infectious diseases in animals have changed several times over the years. Initially,

according to the Ordinance of the Minister of Agriculture and Food, dated January 21, 1999, on detailed veterinary conditions required for organizing or arranging fairs, animal fairs and exhibitions, as well as running animal shelters, the place intended for receiving animals should be at least 300 m from human settlements. Animals arriving at the shelter should be labeled and given a veterinary examination at least once a month. In addition, the shelter had to have separate rooms for sick, aggressive and quarantined animals. Unfortunately, there was no longer a requirement to heat animal enclosures during cold weather, nor were there provisions guaranteeing animals the possibility of necessary movement (Rozporządzenie 1999). It was not until the Ordinance of the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development of November 5, 2002, on detailed veterinary conditions required for the operation of animal shelters that significant changes were introduced. It was ordered to ensure that animals could move freely indoors and to build enclosures that would allow them to pursue their natural behavior. According to the established regulations, animal enclosures also had to include a bed. An obligation was also imposed on shelter operators to hire people trained in animal handling and familiar with animal protection laws to handle animals. However, the obligation to ensure a monthly examination by a veterinarian was abolished (Rozporządzenie 2002). The current Ordinance of the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, dated June 23, 2004, on detailed veterinary requirements for the operation of animal shelters, allowed shelters to be located a minimum of 150 meters from human settlements. The requirement to provide stray animals with enclosures, freedom of movement, beds and care from trained caretakers was retained (Rozporządzenie 2004). The Ordinance of the Minister of Internal Affairs and Administration, dated August 26, 1998, on the terms and conditions of catching stray animals, ordered that stray animals be placed in a shelter immediately after being caught. Of course, it was allowed to keep animals in another place, but only until they were transported to the shelter (Rozporządzenie 1998). Currently, the very act of catching animals without providing them with a place in a shelter is prohibited, except when the animal poses a serious threat to the lives of humans or other animals.

In order to fulfill their statutory obligations, the municipal councils annually, by means of resolutions, determine the so-called programs for the care of stray animals and the prevention of homelessness. The amount of funds allocated for their implementation is also specified. Until 2011, adoption of the program was optional. Now the program must include eight tasks. Some of them, including trapping homeless animals, mandatory sterilization or neutering, and finding new owners for stray animals, can be outsourced to an entity operating a shelter (Ustawa 1997). However, there is no guarantee as to the effectiveness of the latter mentioned task. It is therefore impossible to determine from above the term for which an animal will be placed in a shelter. Its care must be indefinite, carried out until adoption. There are no legal standards that specify the detailed conditions under which animals must be kept in shelters. There are also no regulations specifying at least the minimum area of rooms, the dimensions of beds or the size of kennels. There are no provisions in the current regulations relating to optimal temperature, humidity or air circulation. There is also no clear definition of what is to happen to a dog or cat when it is placed in a shelter. In practice, the search for new owners may be limited only to posting a photo with a description of the animal on the website. This does not amount to a so-called "adoption". Thus, there is an unresolved problem concerning the further fate of animals that no one wants. An increase in interest in stray animals can be positively influenced by modification of environmental factors in shelters. Simple measures, such as placing a bed in the front of a box, providing animals with toys, providing older dogs with larger pens, which encourages them to be more active, make them more "visible" to humans (Karpiński et al. 2012). It seems particularly important to increase the chances of adopting older and non-breed animals, because as indicated by employees of one shelter, such individuals do not arouse interest among people (Bednarczyk et al. 2017).

Nowadays, the number of animals entering shelters each year is very high, as a result of which they are often overcrowded. The main irregularities in them relate to the insufficient number of enclosures, beds, boxes for quarantine and rooms used for isolation. Particularly dangerous situations, endangering the lives of animals, result from the poor technical condition of the premises in which they are housed. Defects found during the conducted inspections are included in the Annual reports on visits to animal shelters (GLW 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018). Currently, only the most common deficiencies are reported (GLW 2019, 2020). The Supreme Audit Office found a significant problem resulting from overcrowding in shelters. In 2011, there were more than 100,000 dogs per about 34,000 places in 150 shelters. In the case of cats, there were 20,000 individuals of this species per 4,000 places (NIK 2016a). Poor welfare due to such high animal density often leads to aggression, maiming and biting, and the spread of infectious diseases. Animals that have limited living space are unable to carry out their natural needs. Excessive number of animals makes it difficult to carry out socialization processes, negatively affects their level of care and contributes to poor welfare. Surrendering a dog to a shelter is a traumatic experience for it, often resulting in the development of separation anxiety, behavioral disorders manifested by hyperactivity and excessive vocalization. In addition, when the animal is left alone in the room it happens that it destroys objects in its environment. Paradoxically, separation anxiety can also be the reason why an adopted dog is returned to a shelter (Osija and Fiszdon 2015).

According to Rode (2015), high stress in dogs entering shelters is also evidenced by the threefold elevated cortisol levels found in individuals during their first day in the shelter. In the following days, with the passage of time and contact with people, they are found to have lower levels of this hormone.

Shelters in Poland vary greatly in size. The smallest are designed for just a few dozen animals, while the largest are capable of taking in up to several thousand individuals. They arouse controversy, mainly among animal rights activists. Despite this, they continue to operate and take in hundreds of unwanted dogs and cats every year under contracts with municipalities. In 2016, in one of the largest shelters in Poland, the sample fee for catching and delivering an animal to the shelter was net PLN 125, and for its stay and maintenance in the shelter was net PLN 7 for each day started. A box fee of PLN 10 per month was also charged (Umowa 2016). An audit by the Supreme Audit Office (NIK) conducted at the site showed that about 30% of the dogs were not walked to their enclosures at all. In addition, not all animals had a chance to find new guardians, as only 1160 out of 3605 dogs and 15 cats out of 52 housed at the shelter were presented for adoption. Based on information obtained from a shelter representative, it was concluded that this was due to the inability to walk on a leash and the poor mental state of some individuals, who did not allow themselves to be properly photographed (NIK 2016b). Perhaps, such actions contributed to the fact that only 297 dogs and 5 cats were taken to new guardians in 2014, while in 2015 there were 307 dogs and 7 cats. This is a very low percentage of animals kept at the shelter. In 2014, only 6.79% of dogs and 10.20% of cats living in the shelter were transferred for adoption, and in 2015, 7.12% of dogs and 10% of cats living in the shelter, respectively (PIW 2014, 2015). For thousands of animals, this means long-term isolation, lack of stimuli and constant human contact. The above factors hinder the animal's socialization and adaptation, and result in a decrease in the already low chance of finding new guardians. According to adopters, animals that returned from so-called "unsuccessful adoptions" had mental problems, socialization problems, escaped, were aggressive, did not accept other animals and were unsuitable for housing (NIK 2016b).

Failure of dogs to satisfy the need for environmental exploration and physical activity, lack of frequent contact with people and changing environment negatively affect welfare, lead to suffering, frustration of animals and emotional disorders manifested by anxiety aggression (Mamzer

2020). Studies conducted in this area also showed that the most common problems occurring in dogs from shelters were aggression towards other dogs and settling physiological needs at home (Boruta et al. 2014). The occurrence of stereotypic behavior in dogs is also influenced by the length of time they have been in the shelter. It was found that aggression, pathological indifference or fear was exhibited by the majority of individuals staying in the shelter for more than one year (Dulis and Mituniewicz 2019). In addition to problems related to limited funding and insufficient living space, there are also cases of mistreatment of animals. At one of Poland's largest shelters in 2020, irregularities were so great that its owner was charged with animal abuse with extreme cruelty (Komunikat PO 2020).

According to the annual Report of the Chief Veterinarian based on visits to 227 animal shelters conducted in 2019, the estimated number of dogs in shelters was 105,188, while the number of cats was 31,116. More than 60% of them were put up for adoption by their existing as well as new guardians. The percentage of mortality due to falls caused by disease or euthanasia, for dogs was 5.56% and for cats 17% (GLW 2019). In 2020 (compared to the previous year), the percentage of dogs in shelters decreased by 12%, while the percentage of cats increased by 4%. 68.5% of dogs and 65% of cats residing in shelters were adopted (GLW 2020).

For example, in 2019, the two largest shelters in Poland, which provide space for a total of 7,600 dogs, had an average adoption rate of 29.35% for animals of this species, with an average mortality rate of 7.5% (calculations based on: PIW 2019a, 2019c). Large facilities are able to take in animals from all over the country, subjecting them to hours of transportation and associated stress. In one of them, dogs were even brought to the facility from a municipality 400 kilometers away, so the transport itself took about 5 hours, which was not good for the animals (Umowa 2018). In the same year, in two very small shelters provided for a total of 49 animals, the average percentage of animals adopted was 89.71% with an average mortality rate of 3.35% (calculations based on: PIW 2019b, 2020). In 2012 (older reports are not published), there were 161 shelters in Poland with 105,539 dogs, 21,832 cats and 128 horses. Fifty-six percent of dogs and 58 percent of cats were placed for adoption. The mortality rate for dogs was 10.31%, for cats 22.53% (GLW 2012).

The actual number of stray dogs and cats in Poland is likely to be higher, as the indicated figures do not take into account abandoned animals in the care of, for example, organizations whose statutory purpose is to protect animals. These organizations do not keep or transfer animals to shelters. Although they are off the record, they nevertheless constitute a significant group in terms of numbers, as they operate in most large cities. In 2022, the issue of bringing abandoned animals from Ukraine will be significant for the number of stray animals in Poland. Already in the first months of the armed conflict, many animal shelters and animal welfare organizations across the country have provided shelter for homeless dogs and cats brought from across Poland's eastern border.

CONCLUSIONS

In Poland, there have been various problems over the years regarding stray animals. Despite legal regulations, the problem of stray animals still exists. Shelters are not always able to provide the animals with appropriate conditions of maintenance. In addition, it is relatively easy to get rid of an unwanted animal. The statutory ban on animal abandonment, is not widely enforced, as there is no mandatory permanent marking of dogs and cats, so in many cases it is impossible to determine the perpetrator of this crime. There is also no obligation to sterilize or neuter dogs and cats, so it is difficult to effectively combat homelessness. Despite legal regulations, the number of stray animals has remained high for years. As a result, more facilities are being established, which, for financial reasons, are willing to accept animals. Doubts about the conditions for keep-

ing animals apply especially to large shelters intended for several thousand individuals. The lack of provisions clearly defining the distances of shelters from cooperating municipalities makes it possible to transport homeless animals over long distances, even hundreds of kilometers, which causes them severe stress. In addition, it prevents municipal employees from carrying out frequent inspections of shelters and makes it difficult for owners to find lost animals. Although today the sight of an abandoned dog is no longer as common as it was several decades ago, the problem of animal homelessness has not been solved.

In order to effectively reduce the number of stray animals, it would be necessary, among others, to make permanent identification of animals mandatory, to widely promote sterilization of mixed-breed animals, to intensify activities leading to an increase in adoptions, and to conduct educational campaigns to raise public awareness of proper handling of animals.

A draft amendment to the Law on Animal Protection was brought to the Parliament in 2021. Among others, the amendment provides for clarification of the obligations of municipalities to implement a program for the care of stray animals, the introduction of an obligation to mark dogs over 3 months of age (chip), as well as the creation of a nationwide register of marked animals, which should definitely help in the process of reducing dog homelessness, strengthen the legal protection of animals and improve their welfare.

REFERENCES

- Archiwum.** 1892. Instrukcja dla Oprawcy w mieście Bochni 12 stycznia 1892 rok. Archiwum Narodowe w Krakowie Oddział w Bochni. Akta miasta Bochni, sygn. 30/1/496, s. 1–3. [in Polish]
- Archiwum.** 1928. Regulamin dla oprawcy miejskiego zatwierdzony uchwałą Magistratu z dnia 24 października 1928 roku. Archiwum Państwowe w Lublinie. Akta miasta Lublina, sygn. 1684, s. 1–6. [in Polish]
- Archiwum.** 1936. Regulamin dla miejskiego oprawcy zwierząt zatwierdzony uchwałą Magistratu, Jarosław 30 maja 1936 rok. Archiwum Państwowe w Przemyślu. Akta miasta Jarosławia, sygn. 425, s. 611–617. [in Polish]
- Archiwum.** 1948. Doniesienia i protokoły w sprawie znęcania się nad zwierzętami. Archiwum Państwowe w Łodzi, Towarzystwo Ochrony Zwierząt w Polsce, Rejonowa Sekcja Inspektorów Zarządu Głównego w Łodzi, sygn. 29, s. 3. [in Polish]
- Archiwum.** 1950. Doniesienia i protokoły w sprawie znęcania się nad zwierzętami. Archiwum Państwowe w Łodzi, Towarzystwo Ochrony Zwierząt w Polsce Rejonowa Sekcja Inspektorów Zarządu Głównego w Łodzi, sygn. 29, s. 12. [in Polish]
- Bednarczyk M., Bombik E, Pietrkiewicz K., Sokół J., Różewicz M.** 2017. Analiza funkcjonowania schroniska dla zwierząt w Ostrowi Mazowieckiej [Analysis of the functioning of animal shelter in Ostrow Mazowiecka]. *Wiad. Zootech.* 3, 94–100. [in Polish]
- Boruta A., Sienkiewicz M., Brzozowski, M.** 2014. Problemy behawioralne psów adoptowanych ze schroniska [Behavioural problems in dogs adopted from shelters]. *Prz. Hod.* 6, 36–39. [in Polish]
- Dulis M., Mituniewicz T.** 2019. Wpływ przebywania psów w schroniskach na występowanie zachowań stereotypowych [The effect of time spent at a shelter on the occurrence of stereotypical behaviour in dogs]. *Prz. Hod.* 3, 18–20. [in Polish]
- Fiszdon K., Boruta A.** 2014. Problem bezdomności zwierząt [The Problem of Homeless Animals]. *Prz. Hod.* 6, 33–36. [in Polish]
- GLW.** 2012. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2012 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- GLW.** 2015. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2015 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]

- GLW.** 2016. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2016 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- GLW.** 2017. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2017 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- GLW.** 2018. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2018 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- GLW.** 2019. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2019 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- GLW.** 2020. Raport roczny Głównego Lekarza Weterynarii z wizytacji schronisk za 2020 r., <http://www.wetgiw.gov.pl/nadzor-weterynaryjny/schroniska-dla-bezdomnych-zwierzat>, access: 20.01.2022. [in Polish]
- Jarosz D.** 2019. Wielka masakra psów w Polsce gomułkowskiej [A Great Massacre of Dogs in Gomułka's Poland]. *Polska 1944/45–1989. Studia i materiały* 17, 103–133. [in Polish]
- Kaliski K.** 2012. Schroniska dla bezdomnych zwierząt Cz. I. Wczoraj i dziś [Shelters for stray Animals. Part I. Past and present]. *Wiad. Zootech.* 2, 45–56. [in Polish]
- Karpiński M., Mazurkiewicz T., Czyżowski P.** 2012. Modyfikacja czynników środowiskowych w schronisku dla zwierząt i jej wpływ na sukces adopcyjny [Modification of environmental factors on animal shelter and its impact on the adoptive success]. *Życie Wet.* 87(8), 692–695. [in Polish]
- Komunikat PO.** 2020. Komunikat PO IV WOS 0610.72.2020, Prokuratura Okręgowa w Olsztynie, Olsztyn 2020, <http://olsztyn.po.gov.pl/aktualnosci/1/1735/tymczasowy-areszt-wobec-wlasciciela-schroniska-dla-zwierzat-w-radysach>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- Krakowskie Stowarzyszenie Ochrony Zwierząt.** 1887. Organ Krakowskiego Stowarzyszenia Ochrony Zwierząt. *Opiekun Zwierząt Domowych i Pożytecznych. O ochronie psów*, 7(1), 107–111. [in Polish]
- Mamzer H.** 2020. Braki urozmaiceń środowiskowych w schroniskach dla bezdomnych zwierząt- ludzka percepcja potrzeb zwierząt, a ich dobrostan [Lack of environmental enrichments in shelters for homeless animals: Animal welfare and human perception of animals' Reed]. *Med. Wet.* 76(5), 273–281. [in Polish]
- NIK.** 2016a. Ochrona Zwierząt w Świetle Kontroli. Ważniejsze nieprawidłowości i dobre praktyki, Nr ewid. 34/2015/KST, Warszawa, 2016. [in Polish]
- NIK.** 2016b. Delegatura w Łodzi. Wystąpienie pokontrolne, LLO.410.003.01.2016 P/16/058, 31.03.2016. [in Polish]
- Osija A., Fiszdon K.** 2015. Lęk separacyjny u psów- przyczyny, objawy i metody leczenia [Separation anxiety in dogs – the causes, the symptoms and the treatment protocols]. *Życie Wet.* 90(12), 793–796. [in Polish]
- Pismo okólne** 1961. Pismo okólne nr 48 Ministra Gospodarki Komunalnej z dnia 3 października 1961 roku, L. dz. URT-IV/92/61 w sprawie uregulowania zagadnienia bezpańskich psów i kotów na terenie miast, <http://www.boz.org.pl/prawo/wytyczne.gif>, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- PIW.** 2014. Raport Powiatowego Inspektoratu Weterynarii w Sieradzu, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/sch_pdf/2014/448.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- PIW.** 2015. Raport Powiatowego Inspektoratu Weterynarii w Sieradzu z wizytacji schroniska za rok 2015, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/sch_pdf/2015/448.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- PIW.** 2019a. Raport Powiatowego Inspektoratu Weterynarii w Sieradzu z wizytacji schroniska za rok 2019, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/sch_pdf/2019/448.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- PIW.** 2019b. Informacja Powiatowego Inspektoratu Weterynarii w Kłodzku, 20.08.2020, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/sch_pdf/2019/400.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]

- PIW.** 2019c. Raport Powiatowego Inspektoratu Weterynarii w Piszcu z wizytacji schroniska za rok 2019, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/sch_pdf/2019/421.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- PIW.** 2020. Informacja dotycząca schroniska dla bezdomnych zwierząt w miejscowości Gózd, 30.9.2020, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/sch_pdf/2019/1177.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- Rode B.** 2015. Przegląd najnowszych badań dotyczących dobrostanu i zachowania się psów [Recent discoveries in canine science]. *Życie Wet.* 90(10), 657–660. [in Polish]
- Rozporządzenie Prezydenta Rzeczypospolitej z dnia 22 marca 1928 r. o ochronie zwierząt.** DzU 1928 r., nr 36 poz. 332 ze zm. [in Polish]
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Rolnictwa i Gospodarki Żywnościowej z dnia 21 stycznia 1999 r. w sprawie szczegółowych warunków weterynaryjnych wymaganych przy organizowaniu lub urządzaniu targów, spędów i wystaw zwierząt oraz prowadzeniu schronisk dla zwierząt.** DzU 1999 r., nr 9 poz. 84. [in Polish]
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Spraw Wewnętrznych i Administracji z dnia 26 sierpnia 1998 r. w sprawie zasad i warunków wyłapywania bezdomnych zwierząt.** DzU 1998 r., nr 116 poz. 753. [in Polish]
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi z dnia 5 listopada 2002 r. w sprawie szczegółowych warunków weterynaryjnych wymaganych przy prowadzeniu schronisk dla zwierząt.** DzU 2002 r., nr 192 poz. 1611. [in Polish]
- Rozporządzenie Ministra Rolnictwa i Rozwoju Wsi z dnia 23 czerwca 2004 r. w sprawie szczegółowych wymagań weterynaryjnych dla prowadzenia schronisk dla zwierząt.** DzU 2004 r., nr 158 poz. 1657. [in Polish]
- Schronisko w Poznaniu.** <http://schronisko.com/o-nas/>, access: 01.07.2021. [in Polish]
- Umowa dotycząca odławiania bezdomnych zwierząt na terenie gminy Rejowiec,** 15.02.2018, http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/2019/060315_u_e0.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- Umowa zawarta pomiędzy Wójtem Gminy Lipce Reymontowskie a Zleceniobiorcą,** 4.01.2016 r., http://www.boz.org.pl/dokumenty/2016/101505_u_e0.pdf, access: 20.01.2021. [in Polish]
- Ustawa z dnia 13 września 1996 r. o utrzymaniu czystości i porządku w gminach.** DzU 1996 r., nr 132 poz. 622 ze zm. [in Polish]
- Ustawa z dnia 21 sierpnia 1997 r. o ochronie zwierząt.** DzU 1997 r., nr 111 poz. 724 zm. [in Polish]
- Ustawa z dnia 11 marca 2004 r. o ochronie zdrowia zwierząt oraz zwalczaniu chorób zakaźnych zwierząt.** DzU 2004, nr 69 poz. 625 ze zm. [in Polish]

POSTĘPOWANIE Z BEZDOMNYMI PSAMI NA ZIEMIACH POLSKICH OD XIX DO XXI WIEKU Z UWZGLĘDNIENIEM NIEPRAWIDŁOWOŚCI W TYM ZAKRESIE

Streszczenie. Bezdomność zwierząt domowych jest zjawiskiem znanym od dawna i stale obecnym w Polsce. Pozostawione bez nadzoru zwierzęta stanowią zagrożenie dla ludzi, ich gospodarstw, porządku publicznego oraz bezpieczeństwa epidemiologicznego. „Problem” ten próbowano rozwiązać już w XIX w. Choć głównym celem przyświecającym wyłapywaniu bezdomnych psów była potrzeba usunięcia ich z przestrzeni publicznej, już w odległych czasach zwrócono uwagę na kwestie związane z nieprawidłowym i brutalnym postępowaniem podczas wyłapywania, transportu, przetrzymywania i zabijania niechcianych zwierząt domowych. Obecnie zwierząt trafiających do schronisk nie można już zabijać, ale problematyka związana z ich bezdomnością nadal jest aktualna i na przestrzeni lat nie została skutecznie rozwiązana. Zmiany ustroju oraz przepisów nie zagwarantowały zapewnienia im należytej ochrony i opieki w schroniskach, wciąż zdarzają się bowiem przypadki niehumanitarnego postępowania wobec zwierząt w tych placówkach. Nie wypracowano także skutecznych rozwiązań zmierzających do istotnego ograniczenia skali zjawiska porzucania psów w Polsce. Brak obowiązku sterylizacji osobników nierasowych powoduje, że jest ich bardzo dużo, w związku z czym w posiada-

nie psa bez żadnych trudności może wejść każdy człowiek, co w połączeniu z brakiem obowiązkowego, trwałego i umożliwiającego identyfikację właściciela oznakowania sprawia, że bezdomnych psów w Polsce wciąż są dziesiątki tysięcy, a odpowiedzialności za ich porzucanie można łatwo uniknąć. Celem pracy jest ukazanie zmian w zakresie traktowania zwierząt bezdomnych w okresie ostatniego stulecia.

Słowa kluczowe: psy, bezdomność zwierząt, schronisko, dobrostan.