The concept of Responsible Pet Ownership (RPO), appeared approximately in the 70s, trying to sensitize people about the treatment they gave their pets. Despite its rapid and wide distribution and the time it has been used by animal protection entities, government and organizations such as the World Health Organization, the situation has not changed, attempts seem unsuccessful and human behaviors continue to affect life of animals, showing that responsible ownership has not fulfilled its objective [3].

The complex situation of stray dogs and homeless people in the country has been going on for several years and over time it becomes more and more acute. Today the situation is relieved both by the media and by parliamentarians and by various studies. The media look at this problem through short-term events linked to the topic, for example, the attack of a dog on a child or the annual rate of dog bites. The State’s response to this problem is practically nil. The canine population that roams the streets, whatever the origin of it, certainly causes various disorders of citizenship, for example, the large accumulation of fecal material scattered on paths, parks or squares that involves the attraction of flies and rodents (potential vectors of infectious and/or zoonotic diseases such as parasitosis), or there is a risk of being bitten by one of these animals, to name a few. From the humanitarian point of view, these animals are affected by their quality of life, since they are exposed to illness, poor diet, being victims of accidents or car accidents, etc [4].

It is more and more frequent the euthanasia policy that is not applied exclusively as a method of overpopulation regulation, but as a prevention mechanism that has become an ineffective mass slaughter practice, although overpopulation affects both man and animal, the main cause of this phenomenon, as already mentioned above is the abandonment of animals, in other words human behavior and imbalances generated and perpetuated by it [5].
The greater evidence supports that children who have witnessed mistreatment towards animals in their family environment have easily witnessed situations of domestic violence towards other human beings or themselves, and animal abuse is a better predictor of violence towards humans than, conversely, the one that mistreats humans from a statistical point of view is not a significant indicator that it will produce an abuse towards animals [6].

When the animal is abandoned, the welfare standards are completely breached, it is subject to inclement weather, hungry, thirsty, prone to accidents, diseases, mistreatment of all those people who do not want to have it nearby, and may even die after a long time of suffering, depending only on their organic resistance and instinct. Although in some similar conditions they also appear inside the houses, just as there is an obvious cruelty in the streets, there is also a covert cruelty inside the homes.

Ethics can be seen from a personal, a professional and a social point of view; Macrobioethics expands this purely human and social reach to a broader one that reaches animals and the environment. An ethical system in which through elements of collective responsibility, granting feasible rights to animals, prior process of individual reflection and awareness and moral equality of animals.

**Conclusion**

Pets are living beings and exercising autonomy we modify their characteristics and decide at what moments to share our home with them, we must provide what is within our reach to meet their needs and provide them with well-being and respect, their recognition as sensitive beings and with the ability to feeling makes us responsible for their destiny.

Concern for the right of animals means limiting the right of rational beings to the expression of various cultural practices that include acts of cruelty.
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