

	Page.
of repayment having been made through the minister of Great Britain, at Wash- ington, <i>held</i> that interest should be allowed on the amount wrongfully collected from the time of payment.— <i>Godfrey Pattison & Co.</i>	301
2. Where it appeared that the duty was paid without complaint many years since, and that the claim was not brought to the notice of the government, and no demand was made for repayment until quite recently; <i>held</i> that, under such circumstances, interest should not be allowed.— <i>Duty on Cotton Goods—C. Wirgman, agent.</i>	311
3. Where drawback for duties was allowed, but was refused, under a controversy as to the construction of a statute, interest was allowed from the time of the demand.— <i>Great Western Steamship Company.</i>	328

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS.

1. Where a claim was presented by American citizens as next of kin and heir of a deceased intestate in England, whose property had gone into custody of the crown for want of heirs; <i>held</i> that it did not come within the jurisdiction of the convention, it not being within the class of cases designed for the adjudication of the commission. — <i>Cook & als.</i>	21
2. The fact that a case is brought within the letter of the convention, is not conclusive as to the question of jurisdiction. The commissioners may go behind this to inquire whether it is within the class of cases that have been recognized as matters of inter- national controversy.....	<i>Ib.</i>
3. Debts due on loans made by citizens to a foreign country are not the subject ordi- narily of international cognizance, but the parties are left to their own remedies.— <i>Holford's case, Texas bonds.</i>	382
4. Where claims for indebtedness against Texas had never been presented or recog- nized by the British government as a subject of national interposition, prior to the convention of February 8, 1853, and provision had been previously made, and acts were then pending, relative to adjustment of the same, between Texas and the United States; <i>held</i> that such claims were not included in the unsettled claims referred to the commissioners, and that they had no jurisdiction over them.....	<i>Ib.</i>
5. Where a ship containing property of an English subject was seized by a piratical vessel on the high seas, and was subsequently recaptured by a United States cruiser, and the ship and property was sold, and the proceeds, subject to certain claims of the captors, went into the United States treasury; <i>held</i> that remuneration should be made to the owner, deducting reasonable expenses and salvage.— <i>Houghton's</i> <i>case.</i>	161
6. Prior to the extension of a territorial government over the Oregon country, settlers had gone in and formed themselves into a temporary government. While in this condition, war occurred with the Indians, and various settlers were killed, and sixty- four persons taken into captivity by them. Application was made to the Hudson's Bay Company for assistance, which was rendered, and through their agency the captives were released. <i>Held</i> that compensation for such assistance was a just claim against the United States, and was allowed by the commission.— <i>Hudson's Bay</i> <i>Company.</i>	164
7. <i>Held</i> , also, that a similar claim for expenditures incurred in procuring, by request of American officers on the coast, the release of American mariners, who had been shipwrecked, and were detained as captives by the Indians, should be allowed.....	<i>Ib.</i>