

Second interview with Stephen Fougere, conducted by Jennifer Murray for the Newport Historical Society on April 14, 1987

MURRAY: I wanted to get on tape what your wife's name is - and your children. We talked a little bit about them, but I didn't get their names.

FOUGERE: My wife's maiden name is Bottomly. She came from Bristol. Her father was quite a baseball player. He was supposed to go with the Red Sox, but he changed his mind about it. They really wanted him. He was a good baseball player.

JM: What position did he play?

SF: He caught. He was a catcher. He was very well-known up in Bristol County for his ball playing.

My mother-in-law's name was White. I don't have any history on her. But her maiden name was White. She just died recently. Her father died quite young - forty-nine.

JM: Oh, I'll say.

SF: My children -- My first is Cathy. My second is Patricia. Then came Stephen - my late son, Stephen. Marie was next, Michael, and Annette.

JM: A big family.

SF: That's six. Right. They kept me busy.

JM: I'll bet. One thing that I didn't ask you about when you were growing up: Was there much of a shell fishery here?

SF: As far back as I can remember, Newport Harbor was always closed to shell fishing. Of course, years ago, we didn't have a sewage treatment plant in those days. Most of the raw sewage did go into Newport Harbor. So it was conspicuously polluted - both by eye and by odor. [chuckles]

JM: [chuckles] Yes, I've heard some stories about that.

SF: Especially in the Long Wharf area. If it wasn't for that, Newport Harbor does have a lot of shell fish. But it's closed to shell fishing. It always has been.

We had some piracy down here in certain times. The pirates would go in at night and take shell fish. But that was a hit or miss affair. They took a big chance on losing their boat and so forth.

So most of your shell fishing is confined to the upper River regions. Of course, they have a pollution problem up there, as well.

I really didn't get into much about shell fish until I went to work for the State. I knew what a quahog was, but I hadn't seen many of them. I've often heard the term "bullrake." I really didn't see one until I went to work for the State. And tongs.

There was a time where we had a fleet of mechanical dredges working in the state. Most of that was done -- There was a lot of piracy. Not that they'd go into the polluted waters, but at night they'd go out and go into the hand rakers' areas - areas that were closed to mechanical dredging. There was a little war going on, mostly in the 1940s and the early 1950s.

When I got on the job, I went to work for the State, John Riga was the director. He said he was going to end the quahog piracy on the bay. It took a while, but after a few years, most of the mechanical dredges (at least) were out of business. We made a lot of arrests, a lot of court cases.

JM: Was that done to keep the hand rakers in business?

SF: I think it was. I think the bottom line is that the bay could not support a fleet of mechanical dredges. They were too efficient. It proved out to be that. Today, I think we have roughly three thousand licensed shell fishermen in the state. These are all hand rakers. As I said, the state couldn't support a fleet of mechanical boats. As a matter of fact, the bullrakers and the tongers do very well at cropping off the resource. It comes back.

JM: What else do they go for besides quahogs?

SF: Quahogs is the number one. I think Rhode Island is probably one of the biggest producers of the hard shell clam in the country. It's a big market.

Some of them are diversified. They may set winkle pots and things like that. Usually, a quahogger, that's what he does year-round.

JM: Is there anyone from Newport that you know of that does that or did do that?

SF: There were a few boats that used to run up the River, but it's a long run. Timmy Peckham was one. I don't know if you've heard of Timmy Peckham. He was a part-time fisherman. He fished with rod and reel. He went codfishing in the winter sometimes. But he was what you'd call a "tonger." He made his livelihood from that.

But most of them work out of Bristol or East Greenwich or Warren - right adjacent to the waters where they normally work.

JM: In those days of the day draggers -- When you were going out with your father, how far did his boat go?

SF: Normally, we fished inside of Point Judith, maybe down as far as Brown's Ledge. In the summertime, we'd go out to what they called the "Mudhole,"

which was east of Block Island, and fish for butterfish.

JM: Did you catch squid then, too?

SF: Squid were very abundant in those days. Yes. Oddly enough, the small squid were in demand more so than the larger squid. Some of the Italians and the ethnic groups went for the real small "callymad," (calamari) they called them in those days. I remember we used to use fine mesh to catch the smaller ones. When we caught the big ones, they weren't worth anything. Today, it's just the opposite.

JM: How late into the season could he fish in those areas?

SF: Well, it was a year-round enterprise. The fishing changed with the species, the migrations. In the summer, we fished for summer flounder, whiting, butterfish, scup. In the wintertime, it changed. Those fish would migrate offshore. We'd fish for the winter flounder, codfish, and sea herring - the smaller of which would be sardines. There was always a pretty good market for fresh sardines.

JM: Did you catch the other members in the cod family - the hakes and the haddock?

SF: Haddock and hake. Haddock is something that -- I remember my father telling me that years ago, when

he first started fishing here -- he was with his brother at the time -- they caught more haddock just offshore (maybe four or five miles off the beach) that he recalled getting tired of cleaning the haddock. You don't see haddock around here anymore. There was a migration of haddock here in those days. But very seldom do you see a haddock around here now.

We fished mostly for cod and sardines in the wintertime.

JM: What was the whiting used for?

SF: There was a big market for whiting. A lot of the ethnic people liked whiting - not too much locally; it was shipped out mostly. It went to New York. From there, they'd go to Philadelphia and different places. They used to butterfly the whiting - what they call "butterfly." They'd split them down the middle, open them up, cut the head off and the tail, and people pan fried them. They're a good eating fish - not as good as some of the others. Today, there's a big demand for whiting. They don't seem to be coming in on the beach like they normally did years ago. I attribute that to the bluefish. We have an overabundance of bluefish now in the summer. I think they have an effect on some of these other

species. They keep them offshore.

JM: How many people would be on a crew on a boat like your father's?

SF: Normally, a dayboat would have two men - a skipper and a deckhand. Sometimes three.

JM: They'd go out early in the morning and come back.

SF: Right. Go out at sunrise and come in at four or five o'clock in the afternoon.

JM: Were there many Newport boats that went offshore at that time?

SF: I don't recall. No, not too many of the larger boats. I think the bulk of your big fleet, the big boats, was either New Bedford or Gloucester. They fished the Georges Bank. They were closer to Georges Bank.

In the 1940s they discovered that on the edge of the continental shelf, from these canyons, the fish that migrated from here during the winter resided out there. Some of the larger Gloucester fishermen came down and fished out of here in the winter. They'd go out to the so-called "canyons." They'd bring in summer species during the winter months. That was something that started, I think, in the 1940s. It became stronger all the time. When that happened, Newport was geographically located in a better position than, say, New

Bedford or Gloucester, because it's a straight line right out to these canyons.

JM: Would they have been stern trawlers or side trawlers?

SF: They were mostly side trawlers, eastern rigs.

JM: Your father's was a side trawler?

SF: His was what you call a "western boat" with a pilot house forward. These were eastern rigs.

One guy in particular, Axel Weiderman, was probably the highliner in his day. He came from Gloucester. I remember some of the trips he used to bring in in the winter months. His particular boat was relatively small. It was about a fifty footer. It was a good sea boat. But, in those days, as I said before, they didn't have good weather reports. They got caught out there many times.

JM: It must have been very dangerous.

SF: It certainly was. They'd put up a riding sail and then just weather it out. That's all they could do. They had no choice. They couldn't come in. But I've seen them come in with the hold full right to the hatch combing with flukes or scup or whatnot.

JM: What kind of person would do that?

SF: He was a good fisherman. Once they found the fish

out there and they knew they could catch them, that's all it took. The incentive was there.

About that time is when they discovered the lobsters being out there - the offshore breed. These were the large lobsters. They couldn't really sell them. There was no market for them. They were selling them ten or fifteen cents a pound locally. What they'd do, they'd go onto lobsters the last two drags. Of course, they didn't have the tanks or the set-up for keeping them alive, so they'd fill the dories up with lobsters and bring them in and sell what they could and give the rest away.

JM: These boats were one main boat that had dories that were work boats?

SF: Yes. These Gloucester boats had a crew of four or five men. They'd fish around the clock. They'd fish watches. Some of them were much bigger. The Agnes and Mernie was the boat I'm talking about. She was lost finally - not with him. He had retired. He had a bad ticker. But one of the other Gloucester fishermen bought the boat. His name was Frank Foot. He was a good fisherman, too. He stayed ashore one trip and his boy took the boat out. They never heard from that boat again. That was lost.

We have a lot of boats in Newport today. At the Parascandolo's, sometimes you'll have as many as fifty boats in here in wintertime - between Parascandolo's, Fatulli's, and Bucolo's. But the bulk of the fleet is working on these canyons, you see. They're not working Georges Banks all the time. They go right out to these canyons. They do very well out there. The boats today are steel boats - modern technology, all kinds of sophisticated electronics. Weather reports are there all the time. They've got two of everything - two radars, two radios, two lorans and whatnot, fishscopes, and the whole works. The boats are much better equipped. But they're fishing the same areas. And there is a risk out there as well. They don't all come back. We've had (what?) two lost out of Newport this winter.

JM: Yes.

SF: But that's where they're fishing. As I said, Newport, geographically, is located very well for that type of fishery for those areas.

JM: Would these be out-of-state people who come here for the season? Or are they mostly locals?

SF: Oddly enough, it's been a very small percentage over the years - the Gloucester and New Bedford fisherman that moved to Newport. They like to

come into Newport. They like to sell their fish here. But they don't seem to have the shore facilities here or the dockage that they'd like to have. So they have to go home. They have to go to New Bedford or wherever.

JM: When did they first start using otter trawls? How early on?

SF: Otter trawls originally were beam trawls. Rather than the otter boards, they used one long beam to spread the net and to sink the net. That's where the term "beam trawler" came from. These were large vessels.

JM: Were they ever here or were they mostly a northern boat?

SF: Gloucester, I guess, and Boston were the beam trawler ports. They used to work primarily on the redfish in those days or the ocean perch, I guess they called them. But the otter trawl -- I don't know just what era it came around. But it replaced the beam trawl. It was more efficient and more compact. The beam trawl is very awkward.

There's been improvements made on the otter trawl through the years. That's a science in itself - having the right type of doors. They call these otter boards the doors. And the right type of a net to cover the bottom.

And a net that will elevate to catch pelagic fish. It's a science, as I say. I was very interested in that when I was fishing.

As a matter of fact, Rhode Island University has a fisheries school. I forget his name. [Andreas] Holmsen, I think his name was. He was very scientific. He knew his stuff when it came to otter trawls. He taught the students over there about it.

JM: Is he not there any longer?

SF: He passed away a couple of years ago. He took a lot of pride in his nets. He made nets and they experimented -- with Federal Grants. They'd loan the nets to the fishing boats for them to try them, which was very good.

JM: Were there any regulations for mesh sizes then, in those early years?

SF: No - not in the early years. That's just recent.

JM: There wasn't a need for it, was there?

SF: No. The attitudes in those days were that the ocean had plenty of fish and man could never deplete the ocean. That seemed to be the accepted attitude. That's changed significantly.

JM: It certainly has. What were the kind of support services on the waterfront here in Newport then? Were there better services?

SF: Well, if you were to measure comparison -- Of course, when we talk about New Bedford, we can't forget Fairhaven. Fairhaven is right opposite. Most of your boatyards or shipyards are in Fairhaven. It seemed like in New Bedford there was a heavy concentration. I mean, that was their business - fisheries. Everything on the waterfront was related to fisheries. On every other street in Fairhaven, was a shipyard or a machine shop. Hathaway Machine Shop -- that's one of the biggest. They made the winches and the hoists and the sprockets and the chain. A fisherman in Newport, if he needs something (most of the time) along those lines, he'd have to go to New Bedford. Even the supply stores for netting, cable, and chain. I guess New Bedford traditionally had these stores and facilities, dating back to the whaling days. I know there's one in particular in New Bedford. You can go in with a shopping list (anything from a net to chain to rope to groceries to foul weather gear) -- I mean, they have it all.

And they're competitive up there. Newport never could compete with their prices. They buy in large quantity. I think that had some bearing on where the fishery would be.

Of course, then they had the fish plants and the processing plants, fillet houses, and freezer plants. It's all there. Newport had very little of that - no processing in Newport. As a matter of fact, the fish that is sold here today, ninety percent of them are trucked to New Bedford to be processed.

JM: Is that what happened to the fish your father caught?

SF: Some of it probably went that way. But the bulk of it was a local -- When I say "local," it was the fish peddlers. There were fifteen or twenty of those around. And the local fish markets. I think, in those days, catching a lot of fish and packaging it and shipping it was risky business. The returns were very small. For the most part, in the early days, we knew what we could sell. That's what we concentrated on. We didn't catch any more than that.

JM: Who were some of those early people that you remember?

SF: I think I mentioned Manual Bonas, who came from Portugal. Ed Grimes, Norm Brownell (who's passed on). Most of these people have passed on. Manual Ferris, Doc Marchetti. My father, of course, and his brother, Ernest. There was a fleet of about

twelve boats at Long Wharf all the time.

JM: What happened to that City Yard?

SF: As time went on, the Parascandolos went into business. They bought a fish pier downtown, which was one of the better piers in Newport. Some of the boats moved up there. I think of the last couple of holdouts here at Long Wharf, Norm Brownell was one of them. He had the old Alice May. I don't know if you've ever heard of it.

JM: No.

SF: Some of the boats were just traditions in those days. You'd mention the boat and it seemed like everybody knew the boat.

The Yacht Club had their interest in Long Wharf. I guess Normie took them to court, and he lost out. He was outnumbered. But it really was never the best of piers. It was a place to tie the boat and a place for a truck to come down and pick up your fish or somebody would come down and bring you ice. But that's what happened.

JM: What happened to all the Greeks that tied up there and lived in those places?

SF: I guess around that time, a lot of them had died off. Their descendants had moved on to various docks downtown. The Violets are down at the Newport Electric Corporation. Fatulli has

facilities there. But Newport always did lack good docking for fishing boats. They never had a city pier for that purpose. I mentioned Long Wharf, but it was just there. They never did anything for the fishermen. They never had good facilities. I think if you had the facilities, Newport could have put New Bedford out of business. We could have competed very well with New Bedford.

JM: Why do you think they never were able to get them?

SF: In those days, the fishing industry was more or less looked down upon. I don't think they saw any strong potentials there. Some of the city fathers just ignored it. In those days, too, I don't think the fishermen were as well organized as they are today. They have some pretty good organizations today - some good spokespeople. That makes a difference.

I think if Newport had known the possibilities of what it could have been, they may have set part of Newport aside for it. I think it should have been done.

JM: Who were those early Parascandolos that you went to work for? How did that all take place - that you got hired by them?

SF: When the Parascandolos started in Newport, they

had a truck. They were peddlers in those days. I remember them coming down to Long Wharf. We were tied up there at the time. My father was the first one to sell them fish. The old man was Nicholas [Parascandolo]. That was the father. He had five sons. The father has since died, and the sons have taken over the business. Since then, the grandchildren are involved. It's a big family.

I was fishing with my father. I left school at sixteen. I had fished summers most of my life. Since I was twelve, I was on the boats during the summer. In 1947, my father had a new boat built. He built it himself. That's the one I told you about.

When I was eighteen, I was a little independent. I tried a couple of offshore trips. I went to the Gully a couple of times.

JM: Oh, I've heard about that. What was that like?

SF: The Gully is those canyons that I was telling you about, a hundred miles offshore. It's a tough place.

JM: Pretty rough.

SF: It's tough in the winter. Yes. And it's barren in the summer, actually. There are no fish there in the summer, other than -- The boats go for

tuna now and surface fish.

JM: What was out there in the winter that you were going after?

SF: They'd be most of the species you'd be catching here in the summer. They go out to the warmer water.

JM: Were you afraid out there ever?

SF: No. I don't know. I don't seem to have enough intelligence to be afraid on the water.

JM: [chuckles] I don't know about that.

SF: I'm more afraid on the expressways than I've ever been on the water. You always had confidence in your boat. Of course, I wouldn't knowingly step into the wrong boat to head offshore. But if you felt the boat was good, you'd get aboard and go.

Anyhow, I was eighteen years old, and the Parascandolos, in the meantime, had a forty-foot dragger. The skipper had become sick. So here was an opportunity for me to start. I asked him if I could go on the boat and they let me run the boat.

JM: Was that The Nancy?

SF: That was The Nancy. Right. So I ran it until 1954. As I explained, we had a hurricane - Hurricane Carol. The boat was tied up at the time. George Condon, who was the diesel mechanic,

got wiped out with the hurricane. So it looked like the boat was going to be laying there for a while. Somebody asked me if I'd like to work for the State for a while. I said, "Sure. I'll take it." I had a family then.

JM: How many children did you have then?

SF: I had two at the time. So I went to work for the State for a couple of weeks, which turned out to be thirty years.

JM: What effect did World War II have on the industry, do you think?

SF: Locally, of course, the Navy was always here in full force. There was a lot of activity in the River, with torpedo testing and ships coming and going all the time. I mentioned the torpedo net, or the submarine net, across the channel. West Passage was all mined. They had that set up so that, on Beavertail, they had a secret station there. I guess it was secret during the war, but we found out about it afterwards. If a ship went by, there was a board where there was an operator. All he had to do was push a button to set off a mine. So they had the West Passage pretty well covered.

Fishing-wise, I think there was more demand for fish during the war because of food scarcities

and whatnot. It seemed that we could sell fish during the war that we couldn't sell previous to the war. One of those was mutton eels. I don't know if you're familiar with mutton eels.

JM: No.

SF: It's a yellowish eel that comes in the wintertime. They're very abundant on the coastline. They're still abundant, but you can't sell them now. But during the war, we were selling them. We were getting three dollars a barrel. They were being shipped to New York.

JM: What were they using those for?

SF: It was a food fish. They're edible, but they're not a delicacy. I recall that being one particular fish that all of a sudden there's a market for. We didn't get much money, but we could make a day's pay at it. It kind of filled in the gaps.

Newport was always a sailor town. A lot of sailors. There were some incidents up the River where a couple of the lifeboats -- The Liberty boats used to come into Long Wharf on the other side. Most of the ships were on moorings. They didn't have the pier facilities. There were several occasions where these boats were swamped and sailors were lost.

I forget how old I was. I might have been thirteen or fourteen. I was with my father one day, and we picked up one of these sailors in the net. He'd been down for a while. I'll never forget that. That really was one of three that my father had picked up. My uncle picked up five.

Of course, in those days -- I don't know if you remember. No, you wouldn't remember. We had a Government Landing right in the heart here - just a little south of where we are now. That's where all the brass used to come in - all the admirals, commanders, and what have you. They had a little reception building there, right on the dock. I remember the pilings being painted white all the time. The dock was kept very well.

Every time my uncle picked up one of those sailors, it had an effect on him. He was a drinking man, but he drank moderately. But when he had one of those in the net, he was good for two days. You wouldn't see him. One of the last ones I remember he picked up -- Of course, the medical examiner would have to come down. But they were sailors, dressed in sailor uniforms. He was so disgusted, he went down to the admirals' dock, so to speak, and dumped the net (fish and all) right on the dock and just took off. I

remember that.

One time there was eleven lost. I think another time, it was thirteen. There was at least two, probably three, incidents.

JM: How did that happen?

SF: Sometimes it gets very rough in the Bay, in a Northeaster or something. These Liberty boats -- In those days, they used these double-ended whalers - whale boats. I think they probably put too many people in them on occasion. It only took one sea to come over the side, and then down they'd go.

JM: Half of them, I'm sure, didn't know how to swim.

SF: I think in the Navy today, you have to know how to swim - at least you should. But in those days, I really don't know. That was tragic. I remember that.

On another occasion -- I wasn't in the boat this day. But my father was up the River. I think one of the British planes was up there. It crashed. They were testing dropping torpedoes and it crashed. He wasn't too far from it. Everybody was killed. He was picking up bodies up there at the site. You kind of knew there was a war on.

[end of side one, tape three]

You don't mind if I smoke?

JM: Not at all. You go right ahead.

How about torpedo testing, that torpedo range? Did that ever interfere with you?

SF: Yes. You brought that to mind. As a matter of fact, we used to drag in the range up there, north of Gould Island. When they were testing torpedoes, you couldn't drag there. So that cut off a large section of the River to the fishermen at that time. There was no ifs, buts, or ands about it. You just couldn't fish on those days in those particular areas.

We used to catch a lot of the torpedoes, though. Torpedoes would go wild. They'd go anyplace in the River. As a matter of fact, we had torpedoes go under the boat on occasion.

JM: They weren't live, were they?

SF: They weren't live. No. But we had one boat that was sunk. That belonged to Ed Grimes.

JM: Did it put a hole in it?

SF: It went right through the boat. Torpedoes are heavy - a lot of horsepower. I'm not sure whether they rebuilt the boat or whether they bought him another boat. They made good for it. They also gave rewards for the torpedoes. Originally, it was twenty-five dollars, then it went up to fifty.

JM: That was a lot of money.

SF: Well, it kind of offset the problems. You really didn't want to get into them for what it was worth.

JM: I bet they really messed up the nets.

SF: They raised havoc with the net. I personally caught one offshore. It was one of the first General Electric torpedoes. I went out this day and went fishing on The Nancy. I got entangled in the torpedo. I knew it was a torpedo because there was nothing there before. It was on ranges. I called the Coast Guard, who in turn called the Navy. They sent out a crash boat. The skipper of the crash boat --

I was disappointed that day. I had put my cables overboard. My net, my doors, and everything were on the bottom. I put a flag on it. They got a hold of my cables, and they couldn't pull the net off the torpedo, which was buried in the mud. Of course, in the meantime, I'm trying to tell them, "Let's get some divers out here to take a good look and try to get my net clear."

When I got in, I was a little frustrated. I called the admiral. I forget who it was. But I didn't want to talk to anybody but the admiral.

The next day, they sent divers out there. They cleared the net. The torpedo was one that they had lost from one of the newest DLs (destroyer leaders). It wasn't a destroyer; it was a destroyer leader. The fish was an electric fish (what they call a "fish") made by General Electric. They wanted that torpedo very much. They had lost it the day before I caught it.

As it turned out, the admiral sent me a commendary letter and I got four hundred dollars for the torpedo - the reward. That was the highlight of the torpedo catching business.

JM: [chuckles] Did that make up for what you missed that day, do you think?

SF: It was a pretty good day's pay. Yes.

JM: Well, that's good.

SF: The damage was slight. I didn't have too much damage. But I would have, if I'd let that guy in the crash boat do what he wanted to do.

JM: So that was after the war that that kind of torpedo was out there.

SF: That was after the war. Right. The war was over when I was sixteen. I remember that. VJ Day.

JM: How about technology when you started working? Did things that were developed for the war find their way into the fishing fleet here?

SF: As I remember, one of the first recorders that was used locally was made by Raytheon. Raytheon wasn't here at the time, I don't believe. But these were small boat recorder-type things. They weren't that expensive. It was something that the local boats could afford.

I think what the Navy had they did in a big way. If they had recorders, everything was big.

Loran probably was the most important thing that the military did, as far as the fishing boats are concerned. That was used quite extensively by offshore boats, because they knew their location all the time. In those days, it was Loran A. The machines were expensive and they were crude to use. There was no automation to the machine. You had a visual screen where you had to line up your lines, and so forth. There was quite a lot to it. You had to adapt to the machine in order to pinpoint your location. The accuracy wasn't as good as it is today, of course. I would say that Loran probably was the number one thing.

When I was fishing in those days, I didn't have any electronics at all to speak of. I didn't have any. I had a fathometer, a compass, and a chart. That's how we fished.

JM: And what you knew.

SF: And your instincts. Right.

JM: All that experience.

SF: Of course, today, it's a different story. I guess you could go back twenty years. It continually got better for the fishermen, electronically-wise.

JM: What exactly were you hired to do when you got hired by the State?

SF: I was hired as a crew member on a State boat. At that time, there were three larger-type patrol boats. The one I worked on was an ex-Coast Guard Picket boat, they call them - thirty-eight footers. It was converted. We had a little cabin in it. We lived on board. Well, we worked forty-eight hours on, in those days, and we had twenty-four hours off. You traveled on your twenty-four hours off, too - back and forth. I used to travel to Wickford to pick up the boat. In those days, there was no Newport Bridge. I used to take the ferry across.

JM: How long did that trip to Wickford take?

SF: It was two hours anyhow.

JM: Oh, it must have been.

SF: Sometimes I'd walk part of the way, if I couldn't get a ride. I'd hitch a ride.

JM: By the time you wait for the ferry --

SF: That's right. We were on a schedule.

JM: What did you do on that boat?

SF: Our main concern in those days, as it is today, was shellfishing and keeping people out of polluted waters. There's always been that incentive for people to go into pollution, because the quahogs are so thick. Of course, in those days, they got fifteen cents a pound for littlenecks. Today, they're a dollar and a half a pound.

I remember we had some sayings about way back then where if a fisherman could work an hour, he'd make twenty dollars - twenty dollars an hour. If he put three or four hours in, that was a big night's pay in those days. Today, they're a dollar and a half a pound, they're probably four or five hundred dollars an hour in those same areas.

JM: Did most of them go out at night - the ones that were doing it illegally?

SF: Yes. It was basically night or in the fog. We towed a chase boat with us. We always had a small skiff with a outboard motor. When I started, the biggest outboard motor in those days was a twenty-five horse. The fishermen always tried to outmaneuver us. They'd put two engines on a boat and operate twins. These were on typical quahog

skiffs. In those days, it was all wooden, flat bottom quahog skiffs. Today, you go up the River and it's all Makos and Sea Oxes - all fiberglass. They really have a fleet of boats up there.

We'd try to keep up with them in that regard. We'd put two engines on our boat. It seemed like when they came out with the thirty-fives, we still had the twenty-fives. The quahoggers always were one step ahead of us. As time went on, we kind of got on a par with them, equipment-wise.

But the biggest fallacy in those days was the law. There were no teeth in the laws. A guy would go out, you'd catch him, you'd chase him, and lock him up and bring him to court. Sometimes they'd plead guilty and sometimes they'd get a lawyer. But, most of the time, they'd plead guilty because the fine was only twenty dollars.

JM: And then they could go right back out again?

SF: They'd be out trying to make their fine money the same day or the same night. That's what you were up against.

JM: You knew it and they knew it?

SF: We knew it, they knew it, and the judges knew it.

As time went on, we had better laws enforced. We have some very stringent laws on the books today, pertaining to pollution. The boat is

confiscated. We always confiscated the boat anyhow for evidence, but now it can be forfeited to the State upon conviction. And the fines are large. There's jail terms in the sentencing, as well. We've sent a few of them to jail for a while. So there is a deterrent, as far as the law is concerned. As far as the money is concerned, the incentive is still there. But we've treated that probably more seriously than any of our enforcement. It was a shame, really, because there were other conservation measures that needed attention that we really couldn't get to.

JM: Like what?

SF: Well, for example, our lobster industry - undersized lobsters and bills that protect the female lobsters. Some of the other phases of the fishery were neglected. They knew it and we knew it.

JM: What other phases?

SF: Basically lobsters, maybe scallop beds where there were scallops, undersized quahogs, undersized clams, blue shelled crabs. Today, of course, we have finfish regulations. But we have to mind the store. That's our attitude. You're dealing with a health situation. A lot of people didn't believe it. I think, in the early days, the

courts didn't believe it.

JM: That you could get so sick from --

SF: That's right. Hepatitis is a very serious thing. We've had a lot of sickness because of polluted shellfish.

JM: Was the pollution worse then or not as serious?

SF: Well, I think the Bay probably, as a whole, is in better condition today than it was in those days, because there is an awareness of pollution - the ocean isn't the place to throw everything. But there's a lot more money that has to be spent. Providence has a serious problem up there with their sewerage treatment plant. It's antiquated. There's still some sewerage going into Newport Harbor, but it's only a small percentage of what's manufactured.

There are a lot of sewerage treatment plants today around the state that weren't here in those days. It's better.

JM: Was that the main problem - sewerage going into the Bay?

SF: I think it was the most conspicuous problem. Today, you have other heavy metals and things of that nature, and the toxics that are thrown in. Oil spills. That was a factor. We had oil spills through the years. I don't like to jump on the

Navy, but I think the Navy was one of the bigger offenders at one time, when they had a lot of tankers transitting the Bay. There was a time there that the Navy, in order to cover up the oil spills, were using these emulsifiers to disperse the oil. Lo and behold, the emulsifiers are a lot more toxic than the oil itself. The oil would float and wash ashore, where these emulsifiers would mix with the water. I'm sure there was fish damage because of those cover-ups.

I remember one of our directors, Carl Boyd, found out about it. He went over to the Navy and kind of raised hell about it. The Navy was concerned about not having the oil leave their facility. But the method was not good for conservation. It's wasn't good for the fishery.

JM: Did they listen?

SF: They did. Yes. There's very little oil being handled now at Melville. In those days, there were ships in and out all the time.

JM: What about the ocean dumping? Did you get involved in that at all?

SF: As a fisherman, what I observed out there when they were dumping -- The dumping ground is within the territorial waters of the state. It's right on the three-mile contour opposite the Ocean

Drive. Following storms, the water used to get very murky out there, very muddy. The general area where they dumped, while they were dumping, the fishing was poor. It was one of the prime areas where the local boats spent a lot of time fishing. I think the local fish traps felt an adverse effect from it. I was strongly opposed to the dumping.

I forget just how much stuff they did put out there, but they put a lot of stuff - a lot from the Providence River. "Sludge" is what they call it. If you ever saw it, it really looks like sludge. It's like tar more than mud or sand.

There were a couple more projects in the works - one primarily from Fall River, which is out-of-state. The director at the time was Dennis Murphy. I suggested to him, rather than let Massachusetts dump their spoils into Rhode Island waters, that Massachusetts should establish their own dump site. He saw it that way. He kind of fought with the Army Corps of Engineers. They came up with a proposal to dump down off Browns Ledge. Well, Massachusetts fishermen didn't want any part of that - which I don't blame them. They'd rather it go out to the Rhode Island dump site.

Anyhow, there was a stalemate. That stalemate still exists, as far as I know. I don't think there's an established dump site in the area for anything of the magnitude that they were talking about. They have small, little dredging projects. I can see the need for dredging, as well. You have to have docking and channels to get into your estuaries and so forth. But to take sludge material that's from some of these rivers where there's been toxic metals and so forth dumped for ions of time, I don't see any benefit to put it into the fishery areas.

I don't know what's going on in that regard. But I know that there are projects. Fall River Project, for one, is a big project.

Originally, when there was a channel dug in Mount Hope Bay, they built an island - Sparr Island. There's an island next to it that was built from the dredging material. I go along with that. If you put it adjacent to the area where it's being dug, out of harm's way, I think it makes a lot more sense than putting it where people are making a living or a livelihood. Or put it in back of bulkheads. That's another way of getting rid of it.

JM: That must have been pretty frustrating.

SF: It was.

JM: Because I think people just have this mentality - dump it in the ocean where you can't see it.

SF: Everything. Right. Out of sight, out of mind.

JM: There weren't that many people, like during your teenage years, who needed to take short lobsters or berried females - were there?

SF: I think the incentive was always there. Of course, in those days, there were probably more lobsters. I don't think there were that many people making a business of it. In those days, lobsters were cheap and lobster meat was relatively cheap. But a lot of fishermen -- not a lot, but there were some fishermen that, rather than give a counter lobster to a friend to take home, they'd take the shorts home and give the friend the shorts.

In some instances, there was some bartering going on with them. I know some of the boats up the river, some of the military boats, had rope. And they [the military men] liked to eat lobster. So a pail of shorts got a coil of rope and things of that nature.

I read a true story once. It was a report from Newfoundland, where they had a very viable lobster industry. They had a cannery. They used

to put three or four lobster tails in^a can. But they had no regulations, no conservation. The following year, it was six or eight lobster tails to the can. Then, after that, it was a dozen, and then to the point where Newfoundland lost its lobster fishery. They literally wiped it out without having conservation. It's needed. You have to have good conservation laws and they have to be enforced in order to have the fishery.

JM: What effect did that dumping have on the lobsters? Didn't that hurt them?

SF: I think the lobstermen were finding problems with it. Of course, that particular area was relatively smooth. It was good dragging area. So it wasn't really prime lobster area. After a storm, I guess some of the mud would wash up on the pots and would annoy the fishery -- the lobster fishery as well.

JM: How did the fishermen react to that? Did anybody ask them?

SF: I don't think, in those days. They may have had public hearings. That was another fallacy. I think the public hearings were usually held up in Boston or Wareham, where the Army Corps of Engineers headquarters are. That's what usually transpires before these things occur. They

have out-of-the-way hearings (where the everyday working man just doesn't have a chance to go up) without representation.

JM: Were you in a pretty unique position, having been a fisherman? Was that pretty unusual?

SF: I had the feelings of those who were fishing at the time. I spoke to a lot of the fishermen before I personally spoke to the director. He, in turn, spoke to the fishermen. When we went up, we went up with fishermen. George Mendonsa was involved. Francis Manchester.

JM: This was for the dumping?

SF: In opposition to the dumping. I think it succeeded. As I said, there hasn't been any more dumping out here. I hope it doesn't occur.

JM: Where was your office? Did you have an office or did you just have to get on the boat every day?

SF: Initially, I worked as a crew member. I worked my way up to boat captain. From there, I was lieutenant. As lieutenant, I was in charge of all the saltwater law enforcement in the state. I did that for eighteen years.

JM: It was Fish and Wildlife that you were a part of?

SF: In those days, they called it the Division of Fish and Game. Fish and Wildlife, with the biologists, were within our division at that time. It was

under the Department of Agriculture. Then, they went to the Department of Natural Resources. That's where the breakup came. They divided the Fish and Wildlife Service into a division, and then we had Law Enforcement. That was my division. After Natural Resources, they formed a new department with additional subdivisions to Environmental Management, which it is today. So there were two changes while I was there.

JM: But you stayed with Law Enforcement the whole time?

SF: Right.

JM: What was the area of the jurisdiction that you worked in? Was it within three miles?

SF: Yes - the territorial waters of the state.

JM: That was the word I was looking for.

SF: The three-mile contour, coast-wise.

JM: Did you get involved at all in the striped bass controversy?

SF: We had one law on the book pertaining to striped bass. And that was the sixteen-inch minimum. The fish traps had some regulations where they couldn't put their leaders ashore at certain times of the year, in order to allow the bass to go through.

The striped bass issue really came to a peak

in the late 1970s. I think what happened, we had a very big year class. I forget when the fish were born. But 1972 was probably the peak of the striped bass landings in Rhode Island. Most of those were by rod and reel fishermen. The abundance of bass during that era made a lot of bass fishermen out of people who weren't bass fishermen. The striped bass, historically, have been in cycles. They have peaks and lows. I think the interest came about because there were so many fishermen that, as time went on, were going on and were finding no success at catching the fish.

There's still a lot of bass around. I think striped bass does need management. I think there should be something done about the spawning areas, where there's a lot of pollution. That seems to be very apparent. The eggs are not hatching down in these spawning grounds.

JM: In the Chesapeake and the Hudson, you mean?

SF: In the Chesapeake and the tributaries to the Chesapeake mainly. I guess the Hudson fish are doing very well, except for the PCB problem, which is another problem. You can talk about striped bass all day and argue about it all day. I've been to a lot of striped bass meetings. There's

some very heated discussions. It seems like some people would like to think that striped bass should be a sport fish. And then, you have the commercial side of it. You have people who like to eat striped bass. The striped bass species is a very valuable species to the nation.

It needs management. Certainly, we have to protect the spawning grounds. I've given up on striped bass myself. It's too much controversy. I used to like to fish for stripers. I did it commercially as a part-time venture.

JM: With a rod and reel?

SF: Rod and reel. Right. I caught quite a few bass. But I haven't been at it in the last three years. I just stay away from it. It's one of those things I don't like to do - go out to catch one fish. If I go fishing, I want to go all the way. There's a lot of preparation involved and a lot of research when you go fishing at it, a lot of nights spent.

But I think they're on the right track. I think the government's getting involved now. I don't think it makes sense for one state to have a set of regulations and another state to have something else. We're all dealing with the same fish that travels along the same coastline. So I

think we're on the right track.

JM: Do you think the sports fishermen and the commercial fishermen will ever be able to coexist peacefully?

SF: Well, they did for years. I mean, there was always controversy. The trap fish account for a good percentage of the landings during the migration - in the spring when they're heading north and in the fall when they're heading south. I think what happened, we have a relatively new fishery that kind of came into being, with the gillnet fishery. It came at a time when people were concerned about the abundance of striped bass. These relatively new gillnets with the monofilament netting are very efficient when it comes to catching fish - especially striped bass. Before they shut off the landings, or the catches, they were doing very well for the time spent and for the effort spent.

I'm not anti-commercial fishermen, but I felt that the gillnet had no place as far as the striped bass fishery was concerned. They're too efficient. Those who were engaged in it, as far as I was concerned, were Johnny-come-lately's or opportunists. It came at the wrong time.

It think some of the people that fish for

striped bass, some of the ardent fishermen, would rather see it closed as it is than have it open up and have the gillnets back where they were.

JM: How about during the 1960s, before the two hundred mile limit was passed? What effect did all that foreign fishing have on Rhode Island?

SF: It had a very adverse effect on the abundance of fish in Rhode Island and offshore. Unfortunately, I think the initial attitude of the scientific community at that time was that there's plenty of fish out there. There's enough there for the Russians and the Poles [Polish] and for us as well, and that maybe they're better fishermen than we are. They did a lot of research. They spent millions of dollars at research.

JM: The scientists did?

SF: The scientists. Federal grants and what have you. In the final analysis, after some of the studies were completed, they found out that calorie-for-calorie -- This is how they measure efficiency. A calorie of fuel produces so many calories of fish. They found out that the American fisherman was actually the better fisherman. What was actually happening out there, the fishery was getting too much pressure. I mean, there was a hundred and fifty to two hundred foreign vessels

out there. They caught a lot of fish because of their size and the size of their nets and the horsepower that they had. They were wiping the Americans out in that respect.

JM: Did you ever go out there while they were?

SF: I made a cruise on the Vigilant of New Bedford with the National Marine Fisheries Service to inspect the Russian vessels while they were out there. I made a couple of boardings on Russian vessels - when they were taking back and sorting the fish.

JM: What was that like?

SF: I was impressed by the size of the vessels to start with. I saw pictures of them, but I didn't realize that they were that big. They were as big as some of the sea-going tankers we have come in.

JM: About how many feet would you say?

SF: I think they were around three hundred feet - the two that I went on. About the length of a destroyer - maybe a little longer. But much wider, much more super-structure. These were factory ships. Everything that went on that boat was processed right on the boat.

[end of side two, tape three]

The two Russian trawlers that we went on were bigger ones, too. The ones we were on were about three hundred and fifty feet. They were factory

ships within themselves. They had larger vessels out there that were transport-type vessels that would unload the factory ships and then go back to the homeland.

There was an old saying out there: You could always tell a Russian ship, because there's no seagulls following it. They didn't throw anything overboard - nothing went to waste.

It was true enough. They talked about under-utilized species of fish that we weren't primarily concerned with. There was very little market for them in this country.

JM: What were those?

SF: They were mostly mackerel, hake, and herring. Herring was the big thing. Of course, the reason the Russians came over here initially was that they cleaned out the Baltic Sea of herring - something that the scientists said couldn't happen. But it happened. It wasn't before too long when they cleaned up most of the herring out here.

I was a member of STAF back in those days, which was Save The American Fisheries. It involved a few members from each of the States' Conservation Departments. We would meet once a month and would talk with legislators.

JM: About when would that have been?

SF: I would say it would be late 1960s and early 1970s. We had bumperstickers made up: "STAF - Save the American Fisheries," "200-Mile Limit," and so forth. We had a lot of interesting meetings. We spoke with people and we tried to bring pressure on -- keep the issue in public view. I think we had a lot to do with the final passage of the two hundred mile limit.

The United States, at the time, was carrying on detente, so to speak, with Russia. It was very obvious that the State Department was sacrificing the fishery in order to maintain this detente. You couldn't talk to the State Department about pushing the Russians away from our shores. They didn't want to hear it.

It finally came to be where we do have that two hundred mile limit.

JM: How did the fishermen feel about the prospect of having the government managing them where they certainly hadn't been their friend before?

SF: Probably that was the one thing the fishermen didn't like. Once there was an establishment of the two hundred mile limit, part of the package would be that Uncle Sam would more or less overview the fishery and control the fishery and

regulate our fishermen as well. There was a large expansion in the fishery once that two hundred mile limit became apparent. Because I think they realized that fish had grown in demand. There was more demand for fish. There were prospects of even selling surplus fish to foreign countries - for example, Japan or even the iron curtain countries.

JM: On sort of a joint venture kind of thing?

SF: The fish were being utilized in foreign countries more so - some of these under-utilized species. I think the fishermen felt that when they got into this thing that as long as there was a place to put it, they could ship it there or it could be shipped there. As I said, there was more vessels, better vessels, built around that time. Most of your steel draggers of today started from that point on.

I think the analysis of the scientific community, when this thing first started about antiquated boats -- I think a lot of the fleet was antiquated. They were old, wooden boats.

JM: Compared to the foreigners'?

SF: Yes - compared to the foreigners'. The fishing business was risky right up through then. A fisherman couldn't go to the bank. These boats

today cost three-quarters of a million dollars - the average boat. Well, with three-quarters of a million dollars in my day, you could buy the whole fleet in Newport and then some. I think you could buy the whole fleet in Rhode Island for that amount of money.

I think the banks saw some future there - that the fishery was going to improve, that there was more demand for fish. And respect for the fishermen went up around that time, as well. It was no longer a poor man's game. Fishermen had potential of making big money, which they did.

The problem today with the American fisherman is that there's a certain amount of greed involved. They don't just want to make a livelihood sometimes. I read a story, as a matter of fact, in the Providence Journal, where one fisherman was doing very well. His family lived in a big house up on the hill - a white house with pillars. They had a Lincoln Continental. He did so well, he bought another boat. He had a six-hundred thousand dollar boat, so he bought two. Then, all of a sudden, the yellowtails started to disappear. The wife was crying about what President [Ronald] Reagan was going to do about it.

The species can only withstand so much pressure. There's only so many fish in the ocean. There's only so many square miles to fish. So greed is in there, too, to an extent.

JM: What do you think about Limited Entry?

SF: I don't like Limited Entry. I think it's unfair. I'd rather limit the efficiency of the fishery itself and let the men be weeded out from the boys, so to speak. Everything gets bigger, more efficient. If you had Limited Entry, I think the big guys would outweigh the little guys.

I think you can do it through closing spawning grounds, regulate the size of meshes on the nets. There are a lot of ways of doing it that are fair to everybody, without saying, "You can go and you can't go." I don't think that's the right approach.

JM: Do you think the enforcement of things like closing spawning grounds and the mesh sizes and the lobster regulations is adequate to keep conservation?

SF: I think that it could be improved by putting more teeth in the laws. You can't make regulations, conservation laws, and enforce them without having sufficient teeth in the law. I mean really hurting the guy that's caught doing the wrong

thing - even putting him out of business. He should get maybe two chances, but he shouldn't get a third chance. The fishery depends now on management. If you get the wrong people in the fishery, they're just going to capitalize on what the other guy isn't doing - take advantage of the situation. He doesn't belong there. It's like a teller in a bank. If he can't be trusted, he shouldn't be there. I think it's come down to that.

I think the laws have to be consistent, as well. The National Marine Fishery Service, with this yellowtail fishery -- They started off with quotas. I think the quotas were doing the job to a certain extent. Not to brag, but I think in Rhode Island, we enforced the quota while I was there. I think we did a very good job of it.

Then, all of a sudden, out of the clear blue, they go from a quota to no quota at all, instead of increasing the quota. The fishermen were happy with the quota. We had a quota of seventy-five hundred pounds a trip. The day after or the week after they knocked the quota off, the boats were coming in with fifty to sixty thousand pounds. It wasn't too long after that, they couldn't go out and catch five thousand pounds. I don't know what

the logic was then. They were considering the larger mesh. They were considering closing grounds. But to go from one extreme to another, to me, lacks consistency which, in turn to the fishermen, lacks confidence. The fishermen say to themselves, "What's going on here?"

That's one of my fears about striped bass - what their proposals are, what we're going to end up with.

In order to have good management regulations, the fishermen have to understand them and believe in them. They're not hard to convince. As a matter of fact, they can contribute in making recommendations themselves, because they're out there and they see the way things are. That doesn't happen often enough to satisfy me.

JM: Did the scientists who were in on the decisions listen as much as they should?

SF: I don't really know. We have a New England States Fisheries Council, which is a very strong arm of the scientific community. The fishermen are represented on this group. From what I've heard, the discussions and the recommendations have to go to Washington. When they come back, they come back altogether different. I think there's political problems involved there.

A friend of mine is on that Council, by the way. You may be interested, if you wanted to pursue this aspect of the fishery. He's very well informed. He's a member of the Council. I'll think of his name in a little while.

JM: Absolutely.

SF: It doesn't strike me right now. He's a nice man, a good fisherman, a very practical person. He's a biologist for the State of Rhode Island. He's on this Fisheries Council. He could fill you in maybe a little bit more in this regard.

Of course, I tease the biologists from time to time, when we talk about things of this nature.

JM: [chuckles] What do you say?

SF: As a law enforcement person, it's easy to pass a law and say, "Well, that's the law, and everybody has to adhere to it." But unless people believe in the law, there's going to be very little adherence. The law has to have a good reason. If you can explain your reasons, people will grab the law, they grasp at it. But if they don't believe in it, you've got troubles.

Anyhow, I think right now something has to be done with respect to management. I don't care what kind of species you're talking about - all of them. They need management.

JM: Which ones are in the most trouble?

SF: As far as the commercial fishery is concerned, yellowtail flounder. That's New Bedford's prime species. To go back to when I was a young boy, that's something you couldn't sell, and very plentiful. But the yellowtail fishery is in trouble. A very valuable resource - especially to New Bedford. The bulk of their fillets is yellowtail flounder. And other species as well. Of course, the haddock has been fluctuating. The haddock, I think, was the first thing to receive attention, as far as conservation laws are concerned. Locally, our codfishery is really at a low point. Of course, there's been a relatively new gillnet fishery involved in the codfishery around here. And they had some very good years. But the last couple of years have been very poor.

JM: How far out are the gillnets set?

SF: They go out twenty, twenty-five miles in the wintertime. Some of these gillnetters are fairly large boats. Some of them are diversified. They gillnet in the winter for codfish and they'll go lobstering in the summer. One in particular goes pogy seigning in the summer. He catches pogies and sells them to the lobster boats. He comes from Fall River. But he does a lot of gillnetting

for codfish in the winter.

The bulk of the gillnet fleet for codfish is fishing out at Sakonnet Point at this time. I think there's a dozen of them over there.

Years ago, in the wintertime, the codfishery was what they called "hook trawls," "tub trawls." A couple of men would go out and set two or three hundred hooks on a longline and catch codfish that way. Then, when the gillnets came along, that was the end of the tub trawl. Tub trawl was a lot of work compared to the gillnet. You don't have to bait a gillnet. You just put it down where the codfish frequent and he runs into it. Tub trawls, you had to have sea clams, quahogs, and you had to bait each hook. It was kind of tedious work - less efficient, but more tedious.

This is my point. The more efficient we get, the more the resource is in trouble. I think, in some respects, we should go back to the more tedious, more cumbersome techniques and sustain the resource.

One of the breakthroughs on the lobster fishery is the hydroslove. Did we talk about this before?

JM: Very briefly.

SF: This is a hydraulic block. All the fisherman has

to do is pick his buoy up from the water, put the rope in that block, and push a button. The block takes all the line in between the buoy and the pot. When the pot comes up to the davit alongside the boat, it stops automatically.

Years ago, the man had to pull each foot of that line in by hand on a winch head. What really transpired was that a man that maybe could handle a hundred pots, today can handle seven or eight hundred pots. So where you'd normally have a hundred pots fishing, you've got seven or eight hundred pots fishing.

I went to a lobster meeting while I was working for the State. The fishermen said to me, "Steve, there's too many pots out there. What can we do?"

I said, "I've got the solution - a very easy solution. Outlaw the hydroslave." Oh, boy. That's like saying "Go on out without a boat," as far as they're concerned. But some of them agreed with me afterwards.

They said, "Yes, but it's automation."

JM: What's the comparison between what someone with a hundred pots used to catch and what someone with seven hundred can catch now?

SF: The guy with seven hundred pots, fishing the same

area, is catching fewer lobsters than the man with a hundred pots. The only salvation is that the poor consumer is paying that much more. The consumer seems to get it all the time. Lobsters in the early days were a quarter a pound. Today they're what? Five dollars, I think, the last I heard.

JM: Oh, at least.

SF: Wholesale, five dollars. But there's a room factor, too. You say, "Well, a guy used to fish a hundred pots." Today, that same guy is fishing seven hundred. But where do you put these pots? The ocean's just so big. Rhode Island Sound is just so big. There's room problems out there. They're setting on top of one another.

JM: Did you get involved in disputes over those things?

SF: There was no legislation or no laws pertaining to where you could put your pots or how to set your pots in respect to the other guy. So it was more or less unwritten laws. The fishermen would try to get along with one another in that regard. There were conflicts. Sometimes, I guess, they were quite heated. I think rationale won out in the long run. Either we get along or neither one of us is going to make out.

There was conflicts between draggers and lobstermen more so than lobstermen and lobstermen, where draggers on smooth bottom were getting tangled in the lobster pots on occasion. That was unintentional, because lobster pots in a net doesn't do the dragger any good. That's the last thing he wants.

I think I mentioned, too, that the savvy lobsterman tries to find out where people drag and the places they can put their gear. They work it out between themselves.

JM: Yes, you did. What about when the Russians were out there? Do you know of people who got fouled up?

SF: When the Russians and the foreigners were out there, it was about the same time that the offshore pot fishery started on that offshore lobster. There were very strong conflicts. I think some of the foreigners did pay for lobster gear that was lost after some long court cases.

JM: Those would have been handled by the Federal Government? Did you have to get involved in those things, too?

SF: No. It was out of our jurisdiction. We had nothing to do with that. There are conflicts offshore today with the American boats, between

the lobstermen and the draggers. They come up with a plan where they graphed off portions of the ocean where lobstermen would put their gear and draggers could drag in other sections. I think that worked to an extent. But there's always those that, if the fish are there, he's going to try to get in and get his fish. If there's pots in the way -- That happens on occasion.

JM: How does all this new technology affect the kind of a person who goes into the fishing industry? When you got going, it seemed like it was mostly a family situation.

SF: I think that kind of holds true today. I think it's a lot easier in the wheelhouse today, as far as running a boat and finding the fish. A lot of the skippers today are college educated skippers. They're smart men. You can't be a dumbbell and run a boat today. You've got a lot more to work with. But still, you've got to have the savvy to work it.

I know there was one group of boats that came up from Florida at one time, four or five years ago. They had some rough crews on these boats. They had a bad reputation around the bars in Newport. But there was a company down there that invested in these boats and sent them up here. I

think they were shrimping originally. There was a decline in the shrimp fishery. So they put these two-week or three-week skippers in some of these boats, and they sent them up to follow the fleet off of Georges. I'm trying to think of the name of the boats. They all had the same name, but they had different numbers on them.

Like I say, there were young skippers on these boats - not much training at all. What they did, actually, was go out and follow the fleet. But they didn't last long. They may have come in with a lot of fish at one time or another. But they didn't last long at all. I think the company folded. I don't see any of the boats around here now. As a matter of fact, some of them got involved with drug running and so forth.

JM: It could be pretty dangerous out there, if you didn't know what you were doing.

SF: If you've got good common sense, and somebody takes the time to explain a little bit about it, and if you can follow people and you have good people on deck, that makes a difference as well. On a fishing boat, the guy in the wheelhouse and the people on deck have to know what they're doing. It's kind of a team effort. It's like everything else.

JM: Is Newport primarily an owner-operated fishing fleet now? Are there any corporation boats here that you know of?

SF: No - not that I know of. It's an owner-skipper situation.

JM: Are there many people left who would have been from the earlier fishing families that you knew?

SF: No, other than the trap fishery. The Mendonsas have been around for many years. The Parascandolos are involved with the trap fishery, as well, down at Sakonnet Point, as well as buying fish. They're the number one buyer in Newport.

A lot of the boats that come in are boats in transit. There are a few boats from Galilee that come over here. There's a few from Connecticut - Stonington. A lot of boats from New Bedford come here to land the fish. Then we still have a few of the small boats, the day boats - very few. That's a thing of the past almost. They're starving. They're not catching that many fish now. They're really hurting.

JM: That's why? Because of the depletion?

SF: Yes. It's tough.

[off/on tape]

JM: What do you think the future of the fishing industry is in this country, with all the new

technology and the management trying to catch up with the efficiency?

SF: I think it's going to be around for a long time, but I do see a need for the management and I see a strong need for strong management. Laws have to be based on good, sound, practical research. I think you have to weed out those who would take advantage of situations, as far as the fishery is concerned.

JM: People on the government end or fishermen or both?

SF: I think fishermen themselves. They are their own worst enemies sometimes. But I think you've got people involved in the fishery that don't belong in the fishery. When the success of the future of the fishery depends on the character of the people involved in it, the fishermen themselves, I think you have to weed out those that don't belong in it. They have to be penalized to the point where any management regulations are going to work.

We have a very valuable resource - the Bay in Rhode Island, Rhode Island Sound, the adjacent waters, the canyons, Georges, and so forth. If they're cared for, and we don't pollute them - because pollution is a factor, too - I see a good future. I wouldn't mind being a young man today,

going into the fishery. But I would look for management. It needs management. Man is very efficient, over-efficient, today. There's a lot of people involved. There's roughly six hundred and fifty draggers in New England waters alone. These are modern draggers, modern trawlers. Their fate -- their success or failure -- depends on how we manage the fishery. I think they should have something to say about it. That's why I mentioned this Fisheries Council with Dave Borden. He's the right man to be up there. He's very practical. I think good things will come of it.

JM: Do you think citizens in general have an awareness of what the fishing industry does, the kinds of things they face, and the need for good management?

SF: I don't think the average John Doe does. Maybe around the waterfront. Maybe in Newport proper and Point Judith there's more of an awareness of it. The population as a whole, the average consumer, I don't think has the vaguest idea of what's going on. I think the most information they get about the fishery is what it costs them to buy a pound of fish. The scarcities reveal that in the price. I think there's enough people aware of the importance of the fishery -- federal, state, and what have you -- that eventually it would be

protected to the point of continuing.

JM: Do you think that Newport is going to be able to keep the State Pier? There seems to be some controversy over whether the State is ever going to put enough money into that to make it a decent place for local boats.

SF: I'm not very much acquainted with that. But I was sorry to see that, initially, when the government gave up the end of Long Wharf -- that's what you're talking about -- it seemed peculiar to me that they didn't consider the fishermen at that time - the State. I mean, that would have been the appropriate time. The State actually owned it. It was theirs to do as they saw fit. That would have been the right time to set aside a portion of it for the commercial fleet.

JM: Did the commercial men try to get them to do that?

SF: Not as a group, I don't think. But I'm sure there were individuals that saw that that was their last opportunity or last hope. It's kind of ironic that the State owns it; private enterprise takes it over; and the State has to buy or lease part of it back to sustain the fishermen. I found that hard to understand. I'd like to see something more permanent there, of course. They need it. That's really the only place that's left.

JM: Anthony Bucolo just sold, recently, to someone who's going to develop the property. Do you think that the other operations, like Parascandolo and Fatulli will be around for a while?

SF: The only thing that I'm afraid of -- In Newport, it seems like waterfront property has gotten to be so valuable that I don't know if there's a temptation -- If you're in business and you're scratching along -- The fishery right now isn't that healthy. A lot of boats come in here, but they're working hard for their trips. They're putting in more days and more time. The margin of profit of the fish is very high. The fishermen get a lot of money for their fish. Somebody that's in business, they still have the overhead - the trucks, the maintenance, the taxes, and the help. Some prospector comes along and wants to build a condo, and you can be rich overnight. They're land rich. There's a shadow hanging over our heads in that regard. I hope it doesn't happen.

[end of side one, tape four]

I go down the dock [to Parascandolo]. They have an office that overlooks the water there. I say, "Boy, what a nice condo this would make."

JM: [chuckles] And what do they say?

SF: "No comment."

JM: I bet they've had a lot of offers.

SF: I'm sure they have. Newport has kind of outpriced itself.

They're situated down at Sakonnet as well. They have the trap fishery down there and they have a dock down there. But there's no facilities to bring in larger boats. The [Sakonnet] Harbor is very shallow. As far as Little Compton people are concerned, I think it's going to stay shallow. They don't want any dredging or anything like that. They just want to keep it small.

Newport has got a beautiful harbor - deep water, natural. It would be a shame to lose it. It would be a shame to lose the fishery. I've heard talk about Melville further up the River. But I don't know. It seems to me that Newport, it's just the attraction. When the boats come in here, I don't know if they'd want to go that far up the River - another seven or eight miles, fifteen miles roundtrip. I don't know if they'd go that far.

JM: How long does that take?

SF: I think the average speed of these boats at maximum speed would be twelve knots. So it would be about an hour up and another hour back. But

then, what are you next to when you're up there? Some of the crews like to go uptown here. They tie up to the dock. They like to go up and have a meal or whatever - have a liberty while they're ashore. They'll pick up a shackle or something for the boat, which they can do. Get groceries. That's important.

JM: Do you think people who live here -- There's such a change in that now, too, but do you think they're aware of how much would be lost if something like the fishing industry weren't here anymore?

SF: I think the average taxpayer or the average resident is more concerned about traffic than anything else. Of course, the sailboats are something. That kind of displaced the fishery to a certain extent. The emphasis seemed to go on sailing. I think if better decisions were made years ago, Newport could be a flourishing fishing village as well as other things. I think fishing is compatible with yacht racing and a lot of other things. But I think we lost it in that regard. I hope we can keep what we have. I hope it isn't all condos all the way down Thames Street.

JM: Me, too.

SF: But only the future will tell.

JM: What draws a person to becoming a fisherman?

SF: Well, as you say, I was kind of born into it. I was born on the water. But it seems that once you're in it, it's tough to get away from it.

I just read a book about the fishing industry up in Alaska. The author was saying that when people retire from their jobs, normally they don't want to go back to the job. They're satisfied to stay away from it. But how many times do you see an old-time fisherman that no longer goes fishing get down on the dock and look out to sea and just long to be there? It's something that gets in your blood, I guess - especially the saltwater.

JM: What did you like the best about it?

SF: I kind of liked the challenge. Getting up in the morning, getting on the boat, and going out and bringing back the bacon, so to speak, was the challenge. I always liked to beat the other guy, be the highliner - not that I always was. That made it interesting. You had four or five boats out fishing. You liked to come in with more than the other guy.

But I like the water. I like to be on the water. It's peaceful out there. Get away from the traffic and everything. Your appetite's better on the water. I eat better on the water.

JM: I'll bet it is.

SF: You sleep better at night, it seems like.

JM: If you sleep. [chuckles]

SF: Yes.

JM: If you get much sleep.

SF: Yes. I always liked the water. I always liked fishing.

JM: What did you like the least about it?

SF: The least....

JM: Was there anything you were glad to get away from? Or did it mostly fit you really well?

SF: I'll tell you. Today, with a boat, there's a lot of responsibility. They say a boat is a hole in the water you keep throwing money into. You can really pour a lot of money into a boat. The upkeep is high on a boat today. The larger the boat, the more upkeep. A boat just can't set at the dock and wait for good times. It's costing you money every day it's there. That's why, if I fished, I always tried to stay within my potential. I didn't want a million dollar boat, just something I could be comfortable in and, at the same time, didn't have to worry about the monthly bills and so forth.

But today, that's what these skippers are confronted with. Of course, the insurance rates

today are so high. And a lot of them have mortgages. Can you imagine having a mortgage on a six-hundred thousand dollar boat, and then have to pay the insurance as well? That boat can't sit still. The resource has to pay for it. That's where the pressure is. There's a lot of pressure on the resource.

JM: Do you have a boat now?

SF: I have a twenty-foot fiberglass boat. I rod and reel fish commercially. I have a license. I trailer the boat. If it's bad weather, a bad week, or no fish, the boat sits in my driveway and I don't worry about it. I bought it piecemeal. I built up on a better engine and a little better tackle here and there. I don't owe anything on it. It's a comfortable feeling in that regard.

I thought about buying something a little bigger - for comfort more than anything else. But for my purposes, I think the boat is good enough for me. I can get out four or five days a week. I fish Buzzards Bay. I go as far as Nomans, Block Island, in the Bay. I don't get rich, but I make a day's pay - enough to pay for the gas and pay for my lunch and have a couple of dollars besides. That's what I planned on doing when I retired. It

was my intention to do that type of fishing.

JM: Who do you sell the fish to?

SF: I sell to Parascandolo mostly. I trailer the fish down. Sometimes we sell in New Bedford or Westport, to the dealers there - depending on the time of the day when we get in.

But the last couple of years, we haven't had the scup migrations go into the Bay.

JM: Is that the one you fish mostly for?

SF: Mostly in the summer - scup. Yes. So I've had to trailer down to Buzzards Bay. I'd like to see the scup come back here like they used to. Years ago, there was a lot of scup in the Bay. So we trailer down there. We go out at five o'clock in the morning, around sunrise, and come in at three or four o'clock in the afternoon. It's a long day. What I generally do, I'll put a long day in and take the following day off. I'll fish hard one day, and then relax the next day.

We'll start fishing down in Nantucket Sound. As a matter of fact, I go down to Hyannis in May. The scup go in there in the spring, after they go by here. They're pretty good money. They're worth money all summer. It's worthwhile to catch them.

After scup, we'll chase some summer flounder.

Usually, we'll scup right up until mid-October.

The scup will be around until mid-October.

JM: In the Cape area?

SF: In the Cape area. Yes. Nomans, Cuttyhunk Islands -- Elizabeth Islands, actually -- Martha's Vineyard. It's pretty country down there. It's beautiful down there. Although, it's very windy down there. You'd be surprised in the summertime. They say Buzzards Bay is the windiest body of water on the coast. You get some afternoon breezes there and it gets quite choppy.

In the fall, we look for codfish. The last few years, there hasn't been any codfish to catch. Blackfish are becoming more of a market fish in recent years. There's more demand for blackfish. Years ago, you couldn't sell them. A couple of barrels would flood the market. So that's kind of displaced the codfish. We chase blackfish right up until the end of November. They're worth forty cents, fifty cents a pound, where years ago, you couldn't get nothing for them.

So I'm pretty busy in the summer. Winter, I work on the boat, work on my fishing tackle, burn wood, and do a little painting. I paint. I like to dab in oils a little bit - just for my own amusement.

JM: Have you always done that?

SF: More or less. Yes. I've always liked to draw. I went into oils -- About thirty years ago, I started painting.

JM: What do you paint?

SF: I like to paint seascapes and things like that. That's why I'm fascinated by some of these pictures in here [room where interview took place]. My children's homes are pretty well decorated with my paintings.

JM: Weren't they lucky?

SF: [chuckles] But it's just for amusement.

JM: When you're fishing around the Cape area, are you gone at night? Or do you come back in?

SF: I come home in the evening. It's a long day.

JM: That is a long day.

SF: A very long day.

JM: What time do you have to leave? At two o'clock in the morning?

SF: I generally leave between three and four. I get down there around daylight. Most of the time, we get home at seven or eight o'clock at night.

JM: It must be beautiful out there.

SF: It's beautiful country. Unlike Newport, there are very few commercial hand-liners that work out of Rhode Island, aside from the bass fishermen. I

think at one time we had two hundred and fifty licensed rod and reel fishermen - these are the fishermen that sell their fish catching them with rod and reel. Since the bass fishery has been put out of business, I don't think there's a half a dozen people that do it commercially out of Rhode Island. But where I fish down there, there must be two or three hundred boats on weekends that are doing the same as I'm doing. They're commercial. There will be four, five, or six people in a boat. A lot of ethnic people. A lot of Portuguese people. They're great fishermen. They're great fishing people.

I get so I know a lot of the people down there, a lot of the boats. I enjoy it. I'd rather do it closer to home, but you have to go where the fish are.

And that's a science, too. Today, I've got more in my little boat than I had when I was commercial fishing on the bigger boats. I've got Loran; I've got recorders, radios, and the whole works - a lot of electronics. It helps find the fish. Of course, in the summertime, these fish go on the wrecks and the hard bottom where the commercial boats can't get at them. There's a very good demand for this scup, so they're worth

money. Some days, we're lucky. We get two or three hundred pounds or more. We average out pretty good.

JM: Who do you go with?

SF: In the summer, my wife used to go with me. But my oldest grandson has been fishing with me the last couple of summers. He's thirteen now and a very good fisherman. He likes it.

JM: What do you do with the fish when you bring them on board? Do you have special facilities?

SF: We carry totes. They're called "totes" - hundred pound boxes. We bring a little ice with us in the cooler. We sprinkle ice on them and cover them over with canvas, and then I deliver them down here in the afternoon as a rule - late afternoon.

JM: When you get in, you get rid of the fish right away, and then go home.

SF: Yes. Right. They're iced.

JM: One thing I would like to talk about is how people cope with the danger of going out far. I know you had said there's a sea for every boat. You really never know what's going to happen out there. Do people talk about that much?

SF: No. Today, the weather's at your disposal twenty-four hours a day. People keep a close eye on the weather.

My wife is a very good sailor. She doesn't come from a sailing background, but she's enjoyed every moment of fishing on the boat and never got seasick. But if she hears a little rumble of thunder, I'd better head for the beach. Because she doesn't like thunder. She doesn't like it at home. But she really doesn't like it on the boat.

JM: I don't blame her.

SF: So I have to be careful of that.

No. I think it's all in the boat and having confidence in the boat, being in the right place, not taking any unnecessary chances. Of course, the further out you go, the more you are at risk as far as getting back home if something should come up.

I told you I feel bad on 195. That's where I feel unsafe - on the highways. I never felt that way on the boat.

I had a bad accident at Block Island in 1982. I got hit by a rogue wave.

JM: What exactly is a rogue wave?

SF: It's unusual. It's something that, for the conditions of the night, so to speak, this wave came from out of nowhere. When you're fishing for bass, you're right in on the rocks. You're very close to the shore. You're fishing just outside

the combers, really. That's where the bass hang. That's where they feed.

We'd been over at Block Island. We hadn't gone over there for three nights, because of the weather. A storm had gone by. The practice was to wait till the sea conditions go down, which we did. We went over this night. There was a little Nor'west wind, which made a little chop, which was no problem. We fished for a couple hours. As a matter of fact, we were anchored and carrying on a conversation. We were anchored about twenty minutes when, all of a sudden, out of nowhere, came this wave.

JM: Did you see it coming?

SF: When we saw it, it was too late. It was just like a black wall of water.

JM: How big?

SF: It was ten feet higher than the top of the boat. It was on a crest. It broke there. It rolled the boat over. I was trapped under the boat for a while. My friend drowned. That was my worst experience on the water. I mean, you have close calls on occasions - especially bass fishing the rocks. Anybody that fishes around the rocks for bass at night will tell you. But that was just something out of nowhere. There wasn't another

wave after it. Had there been, it would have finished me. The water was quite cold. That was, I think, November 17, 1982. I've never really gotten over that. That was a nightmare. But you never know. You never know. It was relatively calm for what we were doing, where we were. Just one wave is all it takes.

JM: Have most people had experiences like that?

SF: Well, I'm sure anybody that's done as much fishing as I did around the rocks at night -- I did a lot of bass fishing; I did that while I was working for the State -- have had close calls. I've had a few close calls myself, but nothing like that. Where we were, we were anchored in, I don't know, eighteen feet of water. We were comfortable. I was confident. For a wave to break in eighteen feet of water where we were, had to be a big wave, a heavy wave.

I've seen nights out here, in front of Newport, where a hurricane's going by that we weren't aware of, that builds up big seas. You'll be fishing at night, and all of a sudden, the seas start to get bigger. But you had time enough to move off.

We fished many nights that were real rough. Probably we shouldn't have been out there. But we

always had the engine running and no anchor out, watching and timing the waves and so forth. But this night here was a night that nothing like that was expected.

People talk about submarines that go by - some of these nuke subs. They put up a big wave. It could have been a wake of a large ship or something. I'm inclined to think it was a remnant wave of the storm from three days before - just one wave. There has to be a first wave and there has to be a last. But having been there for two hours, talking and fishing and all of a sudden, just one big wave. I mean, it broke at the wrong place at the wrong time. If we were ten feet further in, if the wave had broke further out from us, it would have been no problem. Or if we were ten feet offshore, it would have crested under us. But it's just like it came over and whacked. It turned us over just like that. I was afraid that night. That was a tough situation. I was lucky to get out of it.

JM: How did you get in?

SF: I finally swam in. When the boat turned over, I was disoriented. I didn't know where I was. I happened to be in the hatchway under the boat. It was dark. My first inclination was just to drop

down and swim - try to get away from the boat. I tried that twice. I was tangled in line and a few other things. Each time I tried, I was unsuccessful in getting away from the boat, and I had to go back for that hatch where the air was. There was an air pocket.

Meanwhile, the second time I went back to the hatch, I could hear the air hissing out, because there were limber holes in the hatch. The air was just going and the water was rising. So I had one more shot at it. As I went down, I noticed moonlight. It was a full-moon night. There was moonlight flashing down by the hull - which would have been the top of the hull, really, but it was under the water. So I headed for the moonlight and I got up alongside the boat.

There wasn't much of the boat showing. The bow section was floating. I had foul weather gear on. I managed to get my jacket off. When I did, I tied knots in the sleeve. Well, while I was trying to get my boots off -- I had the foul weather pants on -- the jacket floated away from me. There were some waves that night, but one sea came along and took the jacket. I got the pants off, and I was going to do the same thing with the pants. While I'm tying the pants, the sea carries

me over towards the back of the boat. The engine got into the suspenders on the pants. So I lost those.

JM: The engine was still going?

SF: No, no. But the propeller was bobbing up into the water. See, the boat was upside-down.

JM: You didn't have the engine on when this happened?

SF: No. The engine was off.

JM: You were anchored.

SF: It would have stalled anyhow.

Finally, I was running out of strength. I said, "I don't have anything to hang onto. I'm just going to float towards the beach." I sculled myself. I laid on my back. I finally got into the beach. I figure I was in the water about twenty minutes.

When I got into the beach, of course, hypothermia started to set in. I was a little disoriented. I remember that feeling, though - feeling the rocks under my feet. I got into the shore edge and I knelt down. Well, I was kneeling. I stayed there for, it seemed like, a half an hour. I had a job getting up to get help. I was right on the cliff side of the south side of Block Island. I tried to scale the cliffs. I wasn't familiar with the area - where there were

paths or anything. I remember falling off the cliff there a couple of times, half-way up.

JM: Those cliffs are really bad.

SF: Finally, something possessed me to walk toward Soud'east Light on the east side of the Island. As I walked along the shore, I remember seeing a stairway. Actually, they told me afterwards, I went up one stairway and it was locked. There was a gate on it. So I went down and I walked further along, and there was another one that wasn't locked. It was only about a hundred yards -- Not even that, fifty yards or so, there was a house with a light on. I banged on the door. They called the rescue and what have you. They gave me first aid. They saved my life, really.

JM: Those people?

SF: Those people, yes.

JM: They knew what to do?

SF: Yes. They kept me warm in blankets. They got the doctor.

JM: Was it the middle of the night?

SF: Yes. This was about 10:30 or 11:00 at night. That was a tough experience.

The Coast Guard flew me to South County Hospital in a helicopter. The doctors at the Hospital said that they saved my life on the

Island. I think when I got to the Hospital, my body temperature was ninety-two degrees.

JM: I'm amazed that you made it that far. You must have been freezing.

SF: Yes. I was numb. It was a cruel incident.

And then I remember saying, "Well, that's the end of my ocean." It was quite a long convalescence.

The boat was salvaged. It ended up in my brother-in-law's yard out in Portsmouth. Of course, I didn't want anything to do with the boat at that time. But, finally, I guess, I went out and looked at it one day. I said, "I'm going to put it in my garage and go to work on it and fix it up." That's what I did. I've still got the same boat. I changed it around considerably. But the hull itself wasn't damaged, and the bottom of the boat. The top, the super-structure -- See, when it rolled over, it eventually washed in on the beach and smashed in the rocks - the top side. So I had a winter's work to get it back into service.

That was two years before I retired. Peter, who was with me that night, wanted to retire with me. He was younger than I was. I think he was forty or forty-three at the time.

JM: Did you work together?

SF: We fished together. We made an acquaintance at one of these striped bass hearings. He loved fishing as I did. We kind of hit it off very well.

He had his own boat as well. He had a twenty-three-foot Seacraft. We fished together a lot of nights. We kind of planned to do something when I retired, together. Very tragic.

JM: What's the name of that boat?

SF: My boat?

JM: Yes.

SF: The brandname is Seacraft. It's fiberglass.

JM: Your own name for it?

SF: Sea Robin. It's named after my granddaughter. Her name is Robin. Yes. Sea Robin.

So the extent of my fishing now is just rod and reel, chase the fish. If I catch them, okay. If I don't catch them, stay home.

JM: It sounds like a good life.

SF: Yes. It's kind of what I looked forward to doing when I retired. As I worked for the State for those thirty years, it was always part-time. There's many a day I went by Newport Beach and I looked out. I left my heart there and I drove all the way to Providence, and I didn't pick it up

until I came back.

But the State was good to me. I had a very good job up there. I worked with some nice people. We felt like we were doing the right thing - protecting the resources. I was only sorry that, after enforcing the striped bass laws all those years, and then about the time I'm to retire, they shut off the striped bass fishing. But it was understandable.

JM: Talk about a loaded issue.

SF: Oh, yes. I don't know if that's going to straighten out right away. But at least some good things are going to come of it, I'm sure. The awareness of pollution in the spawning areas down around the Chesapeake. I think that's a factor that should be addressed. But it's a costly factor, too. I'm sure it's going to cost a lot of money to clean up those waters. But I think it's worth the while. Congress has to get with it.

JM: When you think of the livelihoods that have been knocked out down there.

SF: That's right. Yes. There's what? Seventeen hundred watermen directly affected by that? [Senator] Chafee is doing a good job along those lines. He's very cognizant of what's going on with the striped bass. And the other female

representative -- What's her name?

JM: [Claudine] Schnieder?

SF: Schnieder. Yes. She's earnest about it.

JM: Is that through efforts of the fishing industry?

SF: I think there's been an enlightenment to these people from the fishing industry. They seem to be willing to take the bull by the horns and do something about it - I hope.

JM: Well, I've gone through most of my questions. I'm sure I've missed a million things that I should ask you.

SF: I'll come back if you want.

JM: Okay. I really want to thank you so much.

SF: It's been my pleasure. I enjoyed it.

JM: My pleasure.

End of interview.



NEWPORT HISTORICAL SOCIETY

82 Touro Street
Newport, R. I. 02840

Newport Historical Society
82 Touro St.
Newport, R.I.

I have tape-recorded interviews with the Newport Historical Society, "the Society," and otherwise set forth and related episodes of my memories and reminiscences.

I irrevocably consent to and forever give to the Society, or anyone authorized by it, the absolute and unqualified right to the use of my memories and reminiscences for such scholarly and educational purposes as the Society shall determine.

The Society agrees not to voluntarily play or present in any way the tape-recorded interviews to anyone other than it, except as may be authorized herein.

I hereby release and discharge the Society from any and all claims and demands arising out of or in connection with the use of such memories and reminiscences, including, but not limited to, any and all claims of libel, slander, and invasion of privacy.

DATED: April 16, 1987

Stephen Gargese
Narrator
8 Keiss Terrace, Newport
Address
Jennifer Murray
Interviewer
Newport Historical Society
Address

Use restrictions, if any: _____