



**HUMANE SOCIETY
INTERNATIONAL**
EUROPE

MPs' draft act amending the Animal Protection Act

TRIS Notification Number: 2024/0550/PL (Poland)

Humane Society International/Europe (HSI) warmly welcomes the Members of the Polish Parliament's proposal to amend the national Animal Protection Act to ban the commercial breeding and rearing of various species, including the American mink, Arctic fox, red fox, raccoon dog and chinchilla, for the purposes of fur production.

The intensive confinement of wild animals in small wire cages in close proximity with one another fur is produced, solely to supply the frivolous needs of the fashion trade, is an inherently inhumane practice. HSI applauds the fact that the proponents of this legislative proposal are seeking to end the cruel and unnecessary practice of fur farming in Poland. Regrettably, the proposal does not cover farmed rabbits, presumably given the widespread erroneous belief that rabbit fur is always a by-product of meat production.

Over the past two decades, the fur farming industry in Europe has been in significant decline, primarily due to increasing public moral concerns about the exploitation of animals for a luxury product like fur for which there are many humane alternatives, as well as serious concerns about the welfare of animals confined to cages on fur farms. In addition, as will be outlined below, the occurrence of the SARS-CoV-2 and variants of the highly pathogenic avian influenza viruses on fur farms also highlighted the public health risks posed by the intensive farming of fur-bearing species. Furthermore, fur production also poses a risk to native biodiversity, given the highly invasive nature of non-native species, such as American mink and raccoon dogs, which are bred for fur.

With this proposal, the proponents are seeking to add Poland to the growing list of European nations that have already decided to prohibit and phase-out fur production. To date, **sixteen EU Member States**, namely Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Czechia, Estonia, France, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Slovakia and, most recently, Romania have taken legislative action to prohibit fur production. Spain has also committed to ending fur farming, already not permitting the establishment of any new mink farms since 2016. In Bulgaria, a Ministerial order was issued in 2022 banning the import and breeding of American mink.

In addition to the aforementioned prohibitions, Denmark, Sweden and Hungary have all passed legislation outlawing the production of specific species, while Germany introduced stringent animal welfare legislation (similar to measures taken in Switzerland) that rendered it economically unviable for fur farmers to operate. Outside the EU, the United Kingdom, Norway, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, North Macedonia and Guernsey have also prohibited fur farming.

The most recent data sourced from fur industry organisations and published by the European Commission in its formal response to the European Citizens' Initiative calling for a 'Fur Free Europe', which was signed by over 1.5 million EU citizens reported that there were 234 active mink farms and 35 active fox farms in Poland.¹ This contradicts the data obtained in early 2024 from the register of Poland's Chief Veterinary Inspectorate, which indicates that there were 360 fur farms in the country. It is therefore postulated that

¹ [Communication from the Commission on the European Citizens' Initiative \(ECI\) Fur Free Europe](#), 21st December 2023.



the operations on 91 registered fur farms have already ceased. Further to this, it is noted that 26% of the fur farms still active in Poland are financed by Dutch and Danish capital.

While HSI would prefer to see an earlier end to this industry than the proposed phase-out by 1st January 2029, we appreciate the political necessity thereof. However, we note that in other Member States, such as the Netherlands, Belgium and Latvia, the phase-out period was instituted to allow producers to generate income to cover the investments that have been made in their enterprises.

It is notable that the present proposal will allow compensation to be granted and paid by the State Treasury to fur producers who are affected by the ban. In other countries, the only state compensation granted was only to cover the dismantling of the fur farms, since the fur producers were expected to derive profit and recoup their investments during the phase-out period.

In this regard, the present legislative proposal represents a generous deal for the fur farmers. as it allows those still conducting activities on the law's effective date to apply for compensation based on a degressive system - the sooner the farms cease operations, the more substantial the compensation awarded. Applicants must provide revenue details and cessation dates confirmed by the District Veterinary Officer. The process is streamlined, with non-taxable compensation calculated from 2019 to 2021 revenues.

Reasons why it is justifiable for Poland to adopt a ban on fur farming

In the following, we outline a number of reasons why it is justifiable to ban fur farming not only on the grounds of animal welfare, but also to protect public health and native biodiversity.

Animal welfare problems are inherent to fur farming

The most commonly farmed fur-bearing species, mink and fox are carnivorous predators and are highly inquisitive, active animals with complex social lives. Unlike most other types of farmed animals, which tend to be flock or herd species, mink are solitary by nature. Mink and fox are both territorial species and, in the wild, go to great lengths to defend their territories. As will be further outlined below, these animals are unsuited to farming conditions and especially intensive breeding and rearing.

Mink farming

In the wild, mink are extremely active and solitary animals, strongly motivated to range over large territories of several kilometres, to hunt by following scent trails, and to create, live in and investigate dens and burrows. As semi-aquatic mammals their territories include lakes and rivers, where they carry out key behaviours including swimming and diving for prey.²

The life that mink are condemned to on fur farms stands in stark contrast to this. The excessive energy of these animals is confined to cages and nest boxes typically measuring 90x30x45cm. Being naturally solitary animals, the stress of being forced to live in cages with siblings, without access to water for swimming, and

² Larivière S (1999) *Mustela vison*. Mamm Species 608: 1–9.



next to neighbouring cages with completely unrelated mink, often leads to fighting, injury, instances of cannibalism and death.^{3,4,5}

Stereotypical behaviour (such as pacing along the cage wall, repetitive circling/nodding of the head, etc.) and auto-mutilation (i.e. sucking or biting of the animal's tail fur, or other parts of the pelts) is routinely observed in farmed mink. These unnatural behaviours provide a strong indication of stress and poor animal welfare.^{6,7,8,9}

Fox farming

Wild foxes can have a home range of 20-30km², and can migrate over hundreds of kilometres seasonally. Their habitat is rich and varied, allowing for key behaviours including hunting, territory establishment and den building, socialisation and mating. By contrast, foxes on fur farms live in battery cages of a typical size of 0.8-1.2m². This space can in no way be described as meeting these animals' physiological or behavioural needs.¹⁰

These battery cages are barren with the exception, in some cases, of a wire shelf and/or an item for gnawing. The persistent lack of meaningful and varied stimulation and opportunity to practice normal behaviours often leads to stereotypical behaviours, repetitive movements that are indicative of a compromised mental state.¹¹ Injuries also occur as a result of fighting with cage mates, which is also a consequence of the stress of confinement.¹²

Welfare problems have also arisen in fox from the fur industry's selective breeding animals to favour large body size and loose skin. In the wild, arctic foxes weigh in the region of 3kg. On fur farms they are reported to weigh in excess of 20kg – over six times the species' natural size¹³. This is done to increase the fur yield per animal, but it is important to note two undesirable consequences of this breeding.

The first is that these grossly overweight animals frequently suffer from a variety of long-term health problems, including infections at the site of skin folds, in particular around the eyes; deformed or 'bent' feet, and difficulty in moving around¹⁴. Secondly, while selective breeding has increased the size of fox, the cage sizes have remained the same, giving the overall result that over time these animals are being afforded less and less space, relative to their size¹⁵

³ Mason GJ, Cooper J, and Clareborough C. "Frustrations of Fur-Farmed Mink." *Nature* 410 (2001): 35-36.

⁴ Hansen SW, and Damgaard B. "Effect of Environmental Stress and Immobilization on Stress Physiological Variables in Farmed Mink." *Behavioural Processes* 25 (1999): 191-204.

⁵ **The Case Against Fur Factory Farming: A Scientific Review of Animal Welfare Standards and 'Welfare'**

A report for Respect for Animals written by Heather Pickett BSc MSc and Professor Stephen Harris BSc PhD DSc [Case-against-fur-farming.pdf \(furfreealliance.com\)](https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/CertifiedCruel_FFA-Research-Report.pdf)

⁶ Mason, GJ "Age and Context Affect the Stereotypes of Caged Mink." *Behaviour* 127, no. 3/4 (1991): 191-229.

⁷ Meagher, RK, Campbell DLM, Dallaire JA, Diez-León M, Palme R, and Mason GJ. "Sleeping Tight or Hiding in Fright? The Welfare Implications of Different Subtypes of Inactivity in Mink." *Applied Animal Behaviour Science* 144, no. 3-4 (2013): 138-46.

⁸ Dallaire, JA, Meagher, RK Diez-Leon M, Garner JP, and Mason GJ. "Recurrent Perseveration Correlates with Abnormal Repetitive Locomotion in Adult Mink but Is Not Reduced by Environmental Enrichment." *Behav Brain Res* 224, no. 2 (Oct 31 2011): 213-22.

⁹ Polanco A. "The Forms of Stereotypic Behaviour in Farmed Mink (Neovison Vison)." University of Guelph, 2016.

¹⁰ Nimon AJ, and Broom DM. "The Welfare of Farmed Foxes *Vulpes Vulpes* and *Alopex Lagopus* in Relation to 10 Housing and Management: A Review." *Animal Welfare* 10 (2001): 223-48.

¹¹ https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/CertifiedCruel_FFA-Research-Report.pdf

¹² Mason, GJ. (1991). Stereotypes—A critical-review. *Animal Behaviour*, 41(6), 1015-1037.

¹³ https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/CertifiedCruel_FFA-Research-Report.pdf

¹⁴ <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4822946/Plight-Monster-Foxes.html>

¹⁵ <https://www.hsi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Five-Freedoms-and-Fur-Trade-briefing-2019.pdf>



**HUMANE SOCIETY
INTERNATIONAL**
EUROPE

Fur industry attempts at ‘humane-washing’

In recent years, the fur industry in Europe has been keen to maintain that it is working to improve the welfare of animals on fur farms. To these ends, they have established the WelFur scheme.¹⁶ This is an industry-led voluntary welfare certificate for fur farms, which in reality requires lower standards than the law in some EU Member States.

The truth is that the intensive battery cage systems that are found on fur farms in the EU have remained largely unchanged over the years. The WelFur programme, which is designed around the current housing systems and current minimum levels of European Union legislation (i.e. Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes and Regulation (EU) 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing), offers neither satisfactory nor reliable solutions to the inherent animal welfare problems associated with fur farming.

For example, the WelFur criteria do not require access to swimming water for mink or sites for digging for foxes. As the ability to search for food in water (mink) and to dig (fox) are to be considered as natural behaviours and the motivation to carry out such behaviour probably is high, the WelFur criteria for the species in question do not meet their specific physiological and behavioural needs¹⁷.

In addition, the WelFur evaluation scheme combines different welfare measures into an overall score for a farm. This practice obscures individual measures and therefore allows serious welfare problems and injuries to be masked. The aim of its scoring system is to rank farms in relation to each other and against “current best practice”.

The WelFur protocol does not assess animal welfare in relation to an “absolute” welfare level, nor does it assess animal welfare on an individual animal level. The WelFur framework is not designed to provide reasonable assurances that individual animals will not suffer from poor welfare.¹⁸

Over the past few decades, the conditions on fur farms across the globe have been documented by animal protection organisations. Time after time this film footage shows the same kind of animal welfare problems that the industry claims it has been actively solving in the framework of the WelFur programme.¹⁹

Even the most recent images captured on European fur farms, including in Poland, which purportedly comply with fur industry welfare standards, reveal animals displaying stereotypical behaviour, self-mutilation, cannibalism, untreated wounds and so forth²⁰. The conclusion that can be reached is that the fur industry’s voluntary welfare standards are not only inadequate, but may also be viewed as tantamount to ‘humane washing’.

Failures to achieve the ‘Five Freedoms’ for farm animal welfare

On the basis of veterinary analysis of footage from fur farms in various locations in Europe, HSI has concluded that the conditions under which fur-bearing species are kept do not even allow the basic ‘Five Freedoms’ for farmed animals to be met.

¹⁶ https://www.sustainablefur.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/WelFur_Briefing.pdf

¹⁷ Mason GJ, Cooper J, and Clareborough C. “Frustrations of Fur-Farmed Mink.” *Nature* 410 (2001): 35-36.

¹⁸ <https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Case-against-fur-farming.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://www.furfreealliance.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Case-against-fur-farming.pdf>

²⁰ <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/sep/29/film-showing-cannibalism-prompts-probable-ban-on-fur-farms-in-poland>



These five freedoms also form the basis for the World Organisation for Animal Health's (WOAH) guiding principles on animal welfare, and are also codified as welfare needs in EU legislation, namely in Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes, as well as the Council of Europe's 1999 Recommendations Concerning Fur Animals.²¹

It should be noted that these Five Freedoms are today viewed by animal welfare scientists as the most basic obligations of those who keep animals, yet fur-bearing species kept on fur farms in intensive battery cage systems are not afforded even these freedoms, nor could they be said to have "a life worth living".

In October 2018, HSI and Finnish organisation Oikeutta Eläimille conducted an investigation on two Finnish fur farms, which have been certified by the European fur industry body as having 'high welfare'. Documentary evidence of the living conditions and the observable physical condition and behaviour of both mink and foxes was recorded and later subjected to veterinary analysis, which focused on the five freedoms and the implementation of Directive 98/58/EC.²² **Footage from Polish fur farms obtained by other organisations show very similar conditions and welfare problems for mink.**²³

There is no doubt that *none of the Five Freedoms* are being met consistently on these farms. By implication, therefore, the conditions are highly likely to contravene the guiding principles of the OIE, the European Directive 98/58/EC Concerning the Protection of Animals Kept for Farming Purposes, as well as the Council of Europe's 1999 Recommendations Concerning Fur Animals.

Such fur farming footage has also been analysed with respect to violations of EU Directive 98/58/EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes. This legislation lays down minimum standards for the protection of animals bred or kept for farming purposes, including for fur production.

Article 4 of the Directive states: 'Member States shall ensure that the conditions under which animals (other than fish, reptiles or amphibians) are bred or kept, having regard to their species and to their degree of development, adaptation and domestication, and to their physiological and ethological needs in accordance with established experience and scientific knowledge, comply with the provisions set out in the Annex.'

Based on the available scientific literature around the physiological and behavioural needs of fur farmed animals, HSI concluded that fur farms do not meet the requirements of Article 4, most notably in relation to: a) the inadequate size of the cages; b) the lack of non-wire substrate to allow for key behaviours such as digging; and c) (in the case of naturally solitary and semi-aquatic mink) the lack of provision of water for swimming and lack of opportunity for animals to withdraw meaningfully from the presence of other animals.

²¹ <https://www.hsi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Five-Freedoms-and-Fur-Trade-briefing-2019.pdf>

²² <https://www.hsi.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Five-Freedoms-and-Fur-Trade-briefing-2019.pdf> See footage here: [Fur Farming in Finland Exposed! - YouTube](#)

²³ https://r.search.yahoo.com/_ylt=AwRE1x5Wm5Ri2asAgRpXNyoA;_ylu=Y29sbwNiZjEEcG9zAzEEdnRpZANMT0NVSTAxOV8xBHNIYwNzcg-/RV=2/RE=1653935063/RO=10/RU=https%3a%2f%2fwww.dailymail.co.uk%2fnews%2farticle-9672989%2fHorrrifying-footage-exposes-grim-reality-mink-fur-farm-Latvia.html/RK=2/RS=iXBYeUb_9IDADTF7IHJRzoeSS0-



Likewise, footage from fur farms routinely show additional failures to comply with the terms of the legislation. For example, injured animals are evidently not being cared for appropriately, or placed in isolation with dry bedding as required by clause 4 of Directive 98/58/EC.

Public health risks

As illustrated above, the living conditions in fur farms, which keep animals in close proximity and at high densities, fail to satisfy many of the animals' most basic welfare needs. Not only are these captive wild animals highly stressed and thus immunocompromised, but they are crowded into close contact with each other's respiratory secretions and excrement. Fur farms also often lack naturally mitigating factors, such as genetic variability and healthy distance between animals. The animals are confined to small wire cages with bedding materials – as well as dried faeces that accumulate under the cages - that also generate a lot of dust.²⁴

For these reasons, fur farms provide ample potential channels for diseases to propagate from one animal to another, and conditions in which viruses may genetically recombine into forms potentially virulent to humans.²⁵ There is also already an unacceptably high level of mortality among animals kept on fur farms. This poses the risk that mortality due to infectious disease may not necessarily be detected. The high density of animals on fur farms also means that it is difficult for workers to frequently monitor the health status of individual animals. Animals suffering from the symptoms of infectious diseases may, therefore, go unnoticed.

As the COVID-19 pandemic has illustrated, fur farms can pose a threat to public health by acting as potential viral reservoirs. Mustelids, in particular, are susceptible to respiratory diseases, including SARS-CoV-2. Since April 2020, this virus has spread in farmed American mink in various EU Member States, as well as in the US and Canada, leading – in some cases – to the mass culling of the animals. Indeed, one of the most recent recorded COVID-19 outbreaks on fur farms was in Poland in March 2023.

Outbreaks of COVID-19 on mink farms in both Europe and North America have clearly demonstrated that it is possible for viral pathogens to jump back and forth between humans and animals bred for fur. The outbreaks of COVID-19 among mink herds also raised serious concerns about the existence of a reservoir of SARS-CoV-2 and genetic mutations in the virus as a consequence of infection in mink could affect our ability to halt the spread of and eliminate the disease. Indeed, the entire Danish mink herd was culled in November 2020 given fears that mutations in the virus in mink, which had already been detected in humans, may undermine the efficacy of future vaccines.

In addition to outbreaks of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, there have also been outbreaks of Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza on fur farms in Europe. In October 2022, the first recorded outbreak of avian flu on a fur farm occurred on a Spanish mink fur farm intensively breeding 52,000 mink. There was also evidence of the first mammal-to-mammal transmission of this virus.²⁶ Since this time, there have been numerous outbreaks of the virus on fur farms in Finland too. To date, around 500,000 foxes, mink, raccoon dogs and sable have been ordered killed on public health grounds after Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza A (H5N1) was found on more than 70 fur farms in Spain and Finland.

²⁴ Koopmans, M. "Sars-Cov-2 and the Human-Animal Interface: Outbreaks on Mink Farms." The Lancet (2020).

[https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/laninf/PIIS1473-3099\(20\)30912-9.pdf](https://www.thelancet.com/pdfs/journals/laninf/PIIS1473-3099(20)30912-9.pdf)

²⁵ HSVMA Statement on Fur-Farmed Animals and the Risk of Disease

https://www.hsvma.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1179:fur_riskofdisease&catid=19:default

²⁶ <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41577-023-00868-8.epdf>



**HUMANE SOCIETY
INTERNATIONAL**
EUROPE

The outbreaks of COVID-19 and Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza on fur farms raise critical issues about the risks posed by intensively keeping animals in close confinement for the purposes of fur production. The continued existence of fur farms, which solely exist for the production of luxury products for which there are many good and humane alternatives, also perpetuates a needless potential reservoir for future emerging infectious viral diseases.

There is no good societal – or moral – justification to allow fur farming to continue. Closure of the industry would only have a limited economic impact on a small group of individuals profiting from the practice of exploiting animals for their fur. The protection of human health – as well as animal welfare – outweighs the interests of a tiny minority who operate fur farms.

It is also pertinent to note that Members of the European Parliament also share these concerns about the practice of fur farming. In their Resolution of 9th June 2021 on the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030, they observe that “fur production, which involves the confinement of thousands of undomesticated animals of a similar genotype in close proximity to one another under chronically stressful conditions, can significantly compromise animal welfare and increases their susceptibility to infectious diseases including zoonoses, as has occurred with COVID-19 in mink”.²⁷

Lastly, during the Agriculture and Fisheries Council meeting of 28th -29th June 2021, the Netherlands and Austria presented an information note to EU Agriculture Ministers on the issue of fur farming. This was formally supported by Belgium, Germany, Luxembourg and Slovakia.²⁸ They called on the European Commission to undertake appropriate action to end fur farming in Europe, setting out their reasons for this request in terms of animal welfare, ethical considerations and the risks posed to public health. At this meeting, 12 Agriculture Ministers spoke in favour of eliminating fur production in the EU, including Poland, Italy and Bulgaria.

Protecting biodiversity

Lastly, in addition to the animal welfare problems and public health risks associated with fur farming, it is also important to note that fur farms also pose a risk to native wildlife. Raccoon dogs have already been listed on the list of Invasive Alien Species (IAS) of Union Concern in the framework of the EU Invasive Alien Species Regulation, just as have muskrats, which have not been farmed for many decades, were introduced into ecosystems in Europe from fur farms and became invasive.

The American mink is one of the most invasive alien species in Europe, but has still not been listed on the list of IAS of Union Concern due to resistance from Member States where fur farming still continues. Fur farms have always been the key pathway of the introduction thereof and this species has long been implicated in the displacement of native mammals and biodiversity loss, particularly voles and ground-nesting birds.²⁹ A Ministerial Decree has also recently been issued in Bulgaria to ban mink farming on the grounds of the invasiveness of the species.

It is also pertinent to note that if infection by SARS-CoV-2 spills into wild mustelids, these could have the potential to become a permanent reservoir of infection for humans and other animal species. Such a

²⁷ https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2021-0277_EN.html

²⁸ <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-10111-2021-INIT/en/pdf>

²⁹ <https://circabc.europa.eu/sd/a/a56cd4b4-4b2c-4b7f-979e-acda14ef2bfc/Neovison%20vison.pdf>



HUMANE SOCIETY
INTERNATIONAL
EUROPE

scenario has been seen before with rabies in raccoons and skunks.³⁰ In some countries, this could also pose a risk to the European mink, which is a critically endangered species and extinct in most of its original range, partly due to competition with the invasive American mink.³¹

At the time of writing, Member States were considering a proposal to include the American mink on the update of the list of Invasive Alien Species of Union Concern. The updated risk assessment, which sets down a highly convincing case for listing this species and was approved by the Scientific Forum, was discussed by Member State experts in October 2024 during 20th Meeting of the Committee on Invasive Alien Species.³²

In sum, the protection of native biodiversity is yet another good reason why the proposed ban on fur farming in Poland is fully justified.

Contact

Dr Joanna Swabe
Senior Director of Public Affairs
Humane Society International/Europe
e. jswabe@hsi.org

³⁰ Manes C, Gollakner R, and Capua I. "Could Mustelids Spur Covid-19 into a Panzootic?". Vet Ital Sep 9 (2020). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32909703/>

³¹ Maran T., Skumatov D., Gomez A., Põdra M., Abramov A.V. & Dinets V. 2016. *Mustela lutreola*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2016: e.T14018A45199861. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2016-1.RLTS.T14018A45199861.en>

³² <https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/98665af0-7dfa-448c-8bf4-e1e086b50d2c/library/444cd3b6-ba27-416f-b29a-c56d59b669a2/details>