

A private Act of Parliament, although strictly and literally followed, as regards the authority and jurisdiction conferred, *Ex parte King*, 2 Bro. C. C. 158; *Ex parte Bolton School*, 2 Bro. C. C. 662, 2 Mad. Chan. 719, is in many respects considered and construed as a mere legal conveyance, in general, binding only on those who are parties to it, that is, those who petition for it, or are named in the Act itself, and those claiming under them. *The Case of the Chancellor of Oxford*, 10 Co. 57; *Hesketh v. Lee*, 2 Saund. 96, a; *Boulton v. Bull*, 2 H. Blac. 499; *Perchard v. Heywood*, 8 T. R. 472; *Wallwyn v. Lee*, 9 Ves. 25; *Bullock v. Fladgate*, 1 Ves. and Bea. 471; *Vauxhall Bridge Company v. Earl Spencer*, 2 Mad. Rep. 355; 8 C. 4 Cond. Chan. Rep. 28; *Edwards v. The Grand Junction Railway Company*, 10 Cond. Chan. Rep. 85; *Moore v. Usher*, 10 Cond. Chan. Rep. 107; 2 Blac. Com. 344; 5 Cruise Dig. Tit. 33. It is never permitted to affect the *interests of strangers, or to

228 defeat the rights of *bona fide* purchasers for a valuable consideration; because, as to strangers, a private Act is considered only in the light of a private conveyance, *Pomfret v. Windsor*, 2 Ves. 480; as where an Act gave the lands of Priory's alien to the king, it was held, that it did not extinguish an annuity of a prior, which he had out of a rectory; although there was not any saving in the Act; and so, too, where a statute makes a conveyance good against the king, or any certain person, it is not allowed to take away the rights of any others, although there be not any saving in the Act. *Sir Francis Barrington's Case*, 8 Co. 271; *Prorost of Eton v. Bishop of Winton*, 3 Wils. 496; *Townley v. Gibson*, 2 T. R. 705; *Riddell v. White*, Anstr. 281; *Dicarris' Statutes*, 635; 5 Cruise Dig. Tit. 33. But where there is an estate in remainder, which the party may bar by a fine and common recovery, in such case, the claimant of such outstanding estate may be bound by a private

The bad legislator wins the hearts of his constituents, by attending to their private and local affairs; at least this is always found, in commercial communities, to be an effectual compensation for the want of statemanship. The justice and propriety of throwing the expense upon individuals desirous of obtaining particular advantages by means of Acts of Parliament, can only be judged of, by ascertaining whether a distinction is always made between a personal and a general object. But it is more than to be suspected, that the reference to the Legislature at all, on many matters, results from the deficiency of other institutions; and therefore, whether the objects be individual or national, there is a wrong done by continuing the system. The probability is, that in one shape or other, in the greater cost of the object, or in the lack of its more expensive use, the nation pays first or last. An instance is mentioned of a case where a bill was withdrawn, on account of the cost arising from these fees; and the writer knows another instance, where the public bodies and inhabitants of a town were deterred by the same reason. From all of which it is to be inferred, that there are other instances of the same kind. In all of which the Legislature commits a wrong.—*Westminster Review*, January, 1834, No. 39, page 33.