These two Bengal Tigers are lazy, but so are all Tigers. These are friends of Phoenix members Tracy and Keith.

Phoenix member Max's daughter Noel with Lion cub Ziporah.

Serval named Bonnie

Phoenix member Max holding Lion cub K.C.

Bobcat named Muffin owned by Phoenix member Lynn.

White Tigers, like this one belonging to a Phoenix E-mail list member, are not a separate species of tiger. They just happen to have white fur in the places where most tigers have orange fur.
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BARCLAYS
A Cat-Fight Brews Over Backyard Wildlife Push for Federal Curbs on Tigers as Pets Is Strongly Opposed by Some Private Owners. Submitted by: ZB By Helen Rumbelow Washington Post Staff Writer Tuesday, September 3, 2002; Page A03
For Suzette Stidom, having a pet tiger in her backyard is one of the rights that make her proud to be living in the United States. Top Cat, who prowls around his enclosure behind Stidom's home in Houston, is just one of an estimated 5,000 pet tigers in the country -- a number believed to be at least equal to the world's wild tiger population. "I got him because I wanted to be different from everyone else," said Stidom, who has owned Top Cat and his companion, a lion, for eight years. "If you can afford to feed them, and keep them safely as they get old, you should be allowed to have one. This is America."

But a coalition of animal welfare groups, headed by the American Zoo and Aquarium Association and the Humane Society of the United States, says the booming trade in pet tigers poses a danger -- particularly to children and the tigers themselves. And it's a danger, they say, that has crept up on Americans without warning. Not only is it legal to keep a pet tiger in most states, but it is also largely unregulated -- a situation responsible, the two groups say, for the reports of pet tigers maiming, or killing, humans every year. From an animal welfare point of view, they say that tigers -- who in captivity are just as fertile as domestic cats -- are filling up animal sanctuaries. They arrive after stalking an owner's children, being found chained up in basements, being used as "guard dogs" by drug dealers or wandering through neighborhoods. The coalition is backing the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, a bill introduced by Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.), which seeks to bar the interstate movement of bears and big cats. This would be the first federal regulation of tigers as pets. Pet tigers are not covered by federal endangered species law because those in private hands usually come from "mongrel" strains. An exception in the proposed legislation would be made for animals that have a permit from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which regulates licensed outfits such as circuses, zoos, sanctuaries or research facilities, Miller said. Noting that both

"The achievements of an organization are the result of the combined effort of each individual." - Vince Lombardi ~ Submitted by: R.Sullivan

Escaped monkey returns to zoo to visit family Submitted by: ZBA monkey which escaped from a Romanian zoo comes back each night to visit his family. Miki, a Japanese macaque, now spends his days in a nearby cemetery but goes back to his old cage at night. He left his mate and a young baby behind when he escaped from the zoo at Tirgu Mures. Miki has been free for a few days now but keepers are not worried as they know he is still in the area. Zoo manager Berecki Maltazar says keepers will try to catch Miki during one of his evening visits. The graveyard caretakers say Miki is not aggressive. The monkey has scared some old ladies who came to take care of their relatives' graves and even managed to steal their bags. But it has become popular with other visitors to the cemetery who have taken to feeding it. Story filed: 12:52 Thursday 5th September 2002

USDA and the American Veterinary Medical Association strongly oppose big cats being kept by untrained private owners, Miller said he believes the legislation is not controversial and could be enacted before the end of the current congressional session. "This is a stunning cultural phenomenon, but it's the first time a serious effort has been made to try and stop it," said Wayne Pacelle, senior vice president of the Humane Society. "There is no justifiable reason for a person to have a tiger or a lion as a pet. These are potentially dangerous animals, and they belong in the wild, not languishing in a dirty cage in someone's back yard in Arkansas or New Jersey or Ohio," he said. The Houston Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals opened a special wing at its shelter to house big cats in response to the increasing numbers. The group rescues about one pet tiger every three months and twice that number of other big cats. Texas does not ban pet tigers but requires them to be registered. "It never ceases to amaze us what people will attempt to keep as pets and under what conditions," said Patricia Mercer, executive director of the Houston group. "These are gorgeous animals, and people buy the kittens as pets for their children -- they reproduce in huge numbers and anyone can get them on the Internet for $500." Celebrity tiger owners, such as Michael Jackson and Mike Tyson, only increase their appeal. "But this is absolutely insane -- children are about the size of their prey in the wild, and they like to stalk them. It is like putting a time bomb in your back yard," Mercer said. There have been three savage attacks by tigers kept in back yards in Texas in the last three years: In October, a 3-year-old boy was killed by his grandfather's pet tiger, and the year before, a 4-year-old had his arm ripped off by a pet tiger kept by his uncle. In 1999, a 10-year-old girl was killed when a tiger clamped its jaws around her head while she was helping her stepfather brush the pet's fur. At least seven people have been killed by tigers in the United States in the last four years, said Philip Nyhus, an assistant professor of environmental studies at Franklin and Marshall College in Lancaster, Pa. This is less than the number killed by dogs, which kill about 15 people a year. But given their relative numbers, it makes tigers one of the country's most lethal pets. When owners grow afraid or tired of the tigers, which grow to 600 pounds and eat 20 pounds of meat a day, the animals often end up at the humane society, Mercer said. Recently, Mercer's inspectors went to a home on an unrelated charge and found five tigers in critical condition and one dead. They had been kept for breeding purposes. Other tigers arrive at the shelter with their paws mutilated by attempts to declaw them with garden shears. The lack of regulation means that no one knows exactly how many pet tigers there are in the United States. The International Species Information System, which tracks the number of animals in licensed zoos and sanctuaries, says there are 1,151 tigers in the world's zoos, about half of them in the United States. No one knows precisely the number of wild tigers -- a highly endangered species -- but conservation experts believe it is about 5,000. The only person believed to have tried to count America's pet tigers is the writer Alan Green, for his book, "Animal Underworld"; he estimated roughly 5,000 five years ago. According to a recent report by the American Zoo and Aquarium Association (AZAA), 11 states, including Maryland, and the District of Columbia ban tigers as pets, and seven states have partial bans. Fourteen states, including Virginia, require permits, and the rest have minimal restrictions, such as asking for a veterinary certificate. Enforcement is often lax, Green said. Green visited most state capitals to get the available documents on pet tiger regulation; in their absence, he made estimates by monitoring trading on the Internet and animals offered to sanctuaries and zoos. "We don't know for sure, but I would feel pretty confident in saying that we have at least as many pet tigers in the United States as in the wild," said Steve Olson, director of government affairs at AZAA. "We know the numbers are large because our members get offered a lot of unwanted tigers every year," he said. "[I]t's hard because zoo collections are very carefully managed genetically and can't just take in a fully grown pet tiger." Groups that oppose such regulation say it tars responsible owners with those who abuse their animals, said Patti Strand, president of the National Animal Interest Alliance. Another organization, the 13,000-strong Ohio Association of Animal Owners, has been active in opposing restrictions on exotic animal ownership; officials did not return calls for comment. "Laws like this have in mind a stereotypical person who owns an exotic without knowing anything about them," Strand said. "But . . . under certain conditions, it can be appropriate. Some people are fanciers who really take a lot of time and care over looking after their animals." © 2002 The Washington Post Company

SAMPLE LETTER FOR OPPOSITION OF HR5226 BILL submitted by: ZB

Dear Representative (insert name),

I would like to express my opposition to HR 5226, “The Captive Wildlife Safety Act sponsored by Congressman George Miller,D-CA.

In his July 25th, 2002 speech Rep. Miller claims that this legislation will " protect the safety of the American public and … protect the welfare of wild animals that are increasingly being maintained as pets. This legislation identifies and provides a solution to a growing national problem that must be addressed. "

© 2002 The Washington Post Company
This nation is at war. The best way to protect the American public and their pets is to fight the enemies of this wonderful country, not to waste money on useless legislation.

There is no confirmed growing national problem regarding exotic pets. This bill unfairly exempts publicly funded American Zoo and Aquarium Association (AZA) zoos and sanctuary organizations. These organizations are accredited by self-appointed private sanctuary associations, The Association of Sanctuaries (TAOS), and American Sanctuary Association (ASA). These groups are private owners. The bill attempts to discriminate against the private owners that have chosen not to belong to their groups by granting their group members special privileges. Setting up a privileged class by legislation is also unfair.

This bill also attempts to unfairly legislate and discriminate against self-supporting, hardworking people engaged in private enterprise. The bill attempts to stop only certain activities with certain animals by the private owners who do not choose to belong to the private groups sponsoring this bill. Private enterprise is at the core of what America’s success is all about. The very people pushing for this bill, TAOS, ASA and AZA are exempting themselves from it.

This bill is equivalent to trying to stop child abuse by legislating against self-supporting families while exempting welfare dependent mothers with 10 kids from the legislation pushed for by the very same mothers.

Thank You.

(name, address, phone, email…)

Life, Liberty, and a Mudhole to Lie In Constitutions are for people, not for pigs. by Wesley J. Smith
09/16/2002, Volume 008, Issue 01

SOMETHING DISTURBING is happening in the Florida elections this fall. No, not the chance that Janet Reno will be the Democratic candidate for governor. A state initiative has qualified for the ballot letting voters decide whether to grant constitutional rights to pregnant pigs.

On the surface, the issue is one of animal husbandry. In the interest of industrial efficiency, and to prevent mother pigs from accidentally rolling on and crushing their offspring, many pig farmers confine pregnant sows in “farrowing crates” during the final stage of pregnancy and for a time after birth.

Supporters of the practice say that the crates, which are seven feet long and two feet wide, ensure the safety and health of the sow and her piglets. A preliminary report of a study by the Iowa State University comparing three different systems for housing gestating sows seems to verify this claim, finding that the crate system produces the "highest farrowing [birth] rate."

But animal rights activists claim that immobilizing the sows in crates causes a "wide range of physical and psychological problems" for the pigs. They want to see this breeding technique banned. Thus, taking advantage of Florida’s easy qualification process for voter initiatives, animal rightists have qualified a proposed state constitutional amendment that, if passed, would make it not just illegal but unconstitutional to confine a pregnant pig "in a cage, crate, or other enclosure, or tether a pregnant pig on a farm so that the pig is prevented from turning around freely." This is a perfectly legitimate subject for public debate, of course, but not in a constitutional context. The constitution of the state of Florida was ordained and established by the people to "secure the benefits" of Constitutional Liberty, “perfect our government, insure domestic tranquility, maintain public order, and guarantee equal civil and political rights.” In other words, the Florida constitution -- like the U.S. Constitution and other state constitutions -- is concerned with the rights and responsibilities of people. It is not for pigs.

This not just an abstract argument, to be hashed out over a morning latte. Through constitutions we establish our form of government and mutually guarantee that none of us will be denied certain fundamental rights. We do so not because we are mammals, but because we are men and women seeking to maintain and protect human liberty and human dignity. Granting animals constitutional rights would cheapen these charters. Indeed, it would undermine constitutions as exclusively establishing and protecting human rights.

This is no doubt the appeal to animal rights activists of the Florida initiative. After all, pig farming is a very small industry in Florida, so small in fact, that only about 300-400 pregnant pigs are housed in farrowing crates at any given time in the entire state. So why invest the nearly $1 million supporters of the initiative claim they will spend in the coming campaign? That's a lot of money to potentially help just a few hundred pigs. But if the goal is to blur
the moral distinction between human and animal life -- well, that, for animal rightists, is worth much more than $1 million.
If we are to avoid "speciesism," their thinking goes, we must give up our belief that life has ultimate value simply because it is human. This objective standard, in their thinking, being steeped in religion or outmoded notions of natural law, must be replaced by a "rational" approach that accords value to each individual -- animal or human -- based primarily on the level of the individual's perceived level of consciousness or the ability to feel pain.
One expression of this view is the bioethical theory of "personhood," according to which rights are based on whether one's "quality of life" is sufficient to qualify for membership in the "moral community" made up of sentient, self-aware "persons." Since value is based on gray matter and not genome, non-sentient humans -- including newborn infants, Alzheimer's patients, the severely retarded, and the comatose, among others -- would be excluded from this community. At the same time, some "nonhuman animals" would be included in the moral community, including dogs, pigs, elephants, dolphins, whales -- perhaps all mammals.
The consequences of such a radical shift in core societal beliefs would be profound. As animal rights author and lawyer Steven M. Wise recently told the Village Voice, establishing legal personhood for animals would grant them "the [same] fundamental rights that we humans have." This would mean, according to Wise, that "If you wanted to do something to violate the animals' rights, at the very least they should have a guardian appointed to represent their interests, the way a human child or any severely impaired human would."
Of course, it is a long way from granting limited constitutional rights to pregnant pigs to expanding coverage of the Bill of Rights to all animals. But it would definitely be a first step on the proverbial thousand-mile journey. And it would not be unprecedented in the world. Little noted in the American media, Germany recently added the words "and animals" to a clause in its constitution that obliges the state to respect and protect the dignity of humans. Where that will lead is anybody's guess.
The "Animal Cruelty Amendment: Limiting Cruel and Inhumane Confinement of Pigs During Pregnancy" promotes a radical agenda behind the seemingly benign facade of animal welfare. Floridians should not be fooled. Farrowing crates may or may not be inhumane. But by voting "no," they can send the important message that constitutions are for humans, not pigs. Wesley J. Smith, author of Culture of Death: The Assault on Medical

Post to list from member networking for information

QUESTION: Does anyone know if there is a commercial staple diet available for the Dasyprocta (Agoutis). What does a recommended daily diet consist of?
Thank you

ANSWER: Maybe the Brisky Pet co. makes a diet for them? They have prairie dog and other exotic diets. My prairie dog doesn't happen to LIKE their food, but that doesn't mean others don't...
Jill

The benefits of joining a group like Phoenix Exotics allows a large knowledge base to be right at your fingertips. Using your own experience and common sense, utilizing the ability to communicate with others throughout the world increases your capabilities in caring for your exotic. ~ Cheri

111 Species Affected by West Nile Story Filed: Monday, September 09, 2002 1:53 AM EDT PITTSBURGH (AP) -- Submitted by: ZB The West Nile virus, first spotted in this country in a sick crow three years ago, has now attacked at least 111 species of birds, including the bald eagle and the endangered Mississippi sandhill crane. The spread of the virus has surprised and alarmed wildlife researchers because it has happened so quickly. Last year, West Nile had been detected only in about a dozen species of birds. This year, hundreds of birds of prey, particularly red-tailed hawks and great horned owls, have been found dead in the upper Midwest, said Kathryn Converse, a wildlife disease specialist with the U.S. Geological Survey's National Wildlife Health Center in Madison, Wis. About 400 owls and hawks died in Ohio alone in what one wildlife official called "a major die-off." The carcasses were being tested for West Nile virus, which has been confirmed in several cases. West Nile also has killed such birds in the wild as the ruby-throated hummingbird and Canada goose, and exotic and captive species such as the macaw and the Chilean flamingo, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Web site. Of particular concern are the deaths of any endangered species, like the Mississippi sandhill crane, which numbers only about 120. It is one of six types of sandhill crane. Since 1999, the virus has also killed at least one bald eagle, a threatened species, according to the CDC Web site. "We don't know of any birds that can't be affected by the virus," Converse said. It's impossible to know exactly how many birds have
died from the West Nile virus, wildlife officials say, because the only way to confirm the virus in birds is to test them after they die. Also, federal agencies like the CDC and Geological Survey rely on state and county health officers to report the bird deaths. But those officials are mainly interested in birds only as a tip-off that mosquitoes carrying the virus have shown up in their areas, so that people can be warned. News that the virus is spreading in bird populations is frustrating for bird caretakers like James Mejeur, curator at the National Aviary in Pittsburgh, because the illness is hard to detect, treat and prevent. Although veterinarians are experimenting with a vaccine approved for horses, the most effective way to prevent birds from getting sick is to control the mosquito population, Mejeur said. Some institutions with captive bird populations install mosquito netting. "It's manageable for us because the majority of our bird population is inside," said Mejeur, whose facility has lost three magpies and a crow this year. "But it is a tough time for zoos and other places that can't control the mosquitoes and have large populations of birds." The horse vaccine has not been widely tested on birds, but the few facilities that have tested it found the birds were not harmed by it, Mejeur said. Still, birds must be injected three times over a span of three months, which can be traumatic to wild populations, he said.

At the Raptor Center at the University of Minnesota, caretakers suspect the raptors may have the virus when they develop tremors, a blank stare and confusion. But other illnesses can cause similar symptoms, said Pat Redig, the center's director. At that point there's not much veterinarians can do but give the animals fluids, antibiotics and special feedings that may help their immune systems. But many raptors infected by the virus die after symptoms appear, said Redig. The Raptor Center has been studying and caring for eagle, hawk, owl and falcon populations since 1974. There is hope that hawks, crows and other birds will become resistant to the virus over time. 

The stated purpose of Phoenix per the articles of incorporation:

"...for charitable educational and scientific purposes; to educate the public in the necessary safety precautions and procedures for dealing with exotic wildlife; and to provide emergency assistance to exotic wildlife in need of care or relocation. Phoenix Exotics Wildlife Association, Inc. is based in the UNITED STATES of AMERICA and addresses concerns within the USA and internationally. Phoenix Exotics Wildlife Assoc. became incorporated in the state of Washington as a non-profit corporation. Phoenix is dedicated to the legal and ethical ownership of exotic animals by private persons with an emphasis on education and safety. Phoenix Exotic Wildlife Association Inc., is an organization of active members working to protect and maintain the rights of private ownership through responsible behavior. WELCOME! — MY NAME IS JEANNE HALL, I AM THE PRESIDENT OF PHOENIX EXOTICS AND WOULD LIKE TO BRIEF YOU ON what to expect in our upcoming newsletters. The newsletter is an avenue to reach our members that are not on our E-list provided by YahooGroups.com. This newsletter will help members who do not have computer access or easy access to our website. We are reaching out to make Phoenix Exotics accessible, including in our newsletter information from our E-list for members that are currently not online. Enjoy!