

1948

## **Polly Aldrich: April 26, 1848.**

United States. Congress. House. Committee on Revolutionary Pensions.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsjunction.msstate.edu/fvw-pamphlets>

---

### **Preferred Citation**

[Physical ID#]: [Item Title], Frank and Virginia Williams Collection of Lincolniana, Mississippi State University Libraries.

This Pamphlet is brought to you for free and open access by the Frank and Virginia Williams Collection of Lincolniana at Scholars Junction. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pamphlets by an authorized administrator of Scholars Junction. For more information, please contact [scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com](mailto:scholcomm@msstate.libanswers.com).

Rep. No. 519.

[To accompany bill H. R. No. 447.]

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

---

POLLY ALDRICH.

APRIL 26, 1848.

Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, made the following

**REPORT:**

*The Committee on Revolutionary Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Polly Aldrich, widow of Clark Aldrich, deceased, report:*

Your committee think that the above named Polly Aldrich is entitled to a pension for one year's services of her husband, Clark Aldrich, deceased; and that the fact of his having served that time is clearly proven by the testimony in the case.

The Commissioner of Pensions has decided against this claim on the ground—

1st. That the time is not sufficiently proven; and

2d. That the name of her husband, Clark Aldrich, is not found upon an abstract of the pay roll of Colonel Lippett's regiment for September, 1776; but that the name of Clark Aldrah is credited on Lippett's rolls with 6s. 8d., in that month, and therefore her husband is not identified.

*First point.*—The time is sufficiently proven. It appears from the testimony of Abel Aldrich, son of Richard Aldrich, whose widow now draws a pension, that he has heard his grandfather, Andrew Aldrich, and his uncle, Clark Aldrich, and his father Richard, frequently talk and tell over, to each other, their services in the revolutionary war, and where they went, and the years they served; and they uniformly said that they all three were out together, in the United States service, at the same time. He further states that he has heard his father say that he was out four years, and his father and grandfather both say that his uncle, Clark, was out most of the time with them; and that he (Clark) served as a private soldier a part or most of the time, but under what officer he could

not tell; but heard him talk of going from Rhode Island, in some company and regiment from that State.

Orpha Aldrich, widow of Richard Aldrich, also swears that, at different times, she has heard her father, and husband, and Clark Aldrich, speak of being in the battle of Bunker Hill, and likewise of going from Rhode Island to New York in 1776; that they were out together in all that year, but under what officers she is unable to state; but she always understood that Clark Aldrich was out in service as long as her husband, Richard Aldrich, was; and she now draws a pension of \$40 a year.

Your committee think that this evidence, standing alone, would not entitle the applicant to a pension; but taken in connection with the other evidence, they consider it a strong connecting link which helps to make out her case. If the committee are satisfied, and can satisfy any doubting person, that the individual on Lippett's rolls and the above named Clark Aldrich are the same person, they think this will favorably determine the case; and this brings them to the

*Second point.*—That the name of her husband, Clark Aldrich, is not found upon an abstract of the pay roll of Colonel Lippett's regiment for September, 1776, &c. Benjamin Crowell, of Providence, states that he has in his possession an original roll of Christopher Lippett's regiment of Rhode Island troops, raised in January, 1776, to serve one year from that time, which roll was put into his hands by William Lippett, a son of said Christopher Lippett, soon after the act of June, 1832. That on the pay abstract of Captain Fenner's company, for September, 1776, of said regiment, is borne the name of Clark Aldrah, as a private; also the name of Andrew Aldrah as sergeant, and the name of Richard Aldrich as a private.

Edward Waterman, of Johnson, in the county of Providence, says that he was well acquainted with Clark Aldrich, formerly of said Johnson; his father's name was Andrew, and he had a brother named Richard. He was well acquainted with them all. He was also well acquainted with Arthur Fenner, a captain in Colonel Lippett's regiment of Rhode Island troops; he was an uncle of mine. Andrew was a sergeant, and Richard was a private in said company, and he believes, also, Clark was a private in said company. This was in the year 1776. After the war, they all moved up country, and I have not seen them since.

Several witnesses testify that the Aldrichs above named lived in Rhode Island during the revolutionary war, and, after it, moved to New Hampshire. One of the witnesses states that the above named Clark Aldrich moved, with his father's family, after the war, from the town of Johnson, in Rhode Island, to New Hampshire.

From this fact your committee are inclined to believe that the individuals mentioned in the two last affidavits are the same individuals named in the other affidavits, and that the Clark Aldrah and Richard Aldrah found on the pay roll of Colonel Lippett are intended for Clark Aldrich and Richard Aldrich. They think that, unintentionally, the letters "i" and "c" have become united, so as

to form an "a," and then the name would be changed, as above mentioned, from Aldrich to Aldrah.

John Howland testifies that the fact of Clark Aldrich being charged 6s. 8d. on the pay roll, in September, 1776, only goes to prove that he had received some articles of clothing, as in such case the money that was paid was only charged, and not the articles of clothing. He further states that at the expiration of the year, the brigade consented to serve and did serve for a month or six weeks longer.

The marriage of the said Polly with the said Clark before 1794, his death, and the fact that she is his widow, are proven to the satisfaction of the committee.

The committee deem it proper not to give their own reasons more at length, for allowing this claim, since it was a case which the Commissioner of Pensions had decided against; but have, on that account, stated the evidence more fully; and, believing that this is a just claim, they ask that the prayer of the petitioner may be granted, and they accordingly report a bill.