

the Succession, or to get Relief of debts of the Deceased, ought to be
 precisely or line made to bring into the Mass of the Substance of his
 father or other Ascendant to Whom they succeed, the things which
 have been given them by the said Ascendant, that they may be Divided be-
 tween them and their Heirs in the same manner, as the other
 goods of the Succession, or if they retain what they ought to bring
 into the Substance they should take so much less out of it. *Novo*
Cap. 6. pro. Which Reciprocal Joining or Contribution of pro-
sons provisions or other things formerly Received out of the estate
of the Deceased, is termed Collation of Goods, and in England goes
the Name of Rottepol. This Collation of goods (Which had its Ori-
gin in the Roman Law Nov. 16 Cap. 6. Auth. ex testamento & c. de
is founded on the Natural Equality among Children in the Succession
of their Ascendants; and upon the Presumption that such gifts
were Made only by Way of Advance to the Portion of a part of
which they might Expect out of the Succession. Besides, it is
that the burden of the debts of the Deceased should be proportion-
ed upon each heir portioner, according to the Benefit they receive
by Succession to him Mediate, or Immediately. By the Law of In-
heritance, one of several Daughters to whom the father Disposed in
his Contract of Marriage a part of his heritable estate,
was found to have right to an equal share of the Debt of the
Deceased as heir portioner with her Sisters, without Communica-
ting and bringing in to them what she had Received before
her Contract; for Collation takes place here only in Moveable
20 Decemb. 1673 Jack contra Jacks. Vid. infra praeviousd. Item he
owing Died without issue except as heir to his father in lands
and not in the titles thereof to which the father had a Separ-
ate right, and his Sister German having entred heir to her brother
in the lands; she and a sister by the fathers side who entred
heir portioners to the father in the titles that were not
established in the brother's person, were liable to relieve or
another of the fathers debts, not equally, but according to the
proportions of his estate they succeeded to Mediate, and Immed-
ately; that in the one referring to the half of the titles, and the other
according to the land and other half of the titles. 10 June 1673. The
contra of which it was alledged, that heir portioners are
not obliged to collate any more than what they had Imme-
diately from the Deceased whose heir portioners they are; of
often happens, that by a fathers Making provision in favor
of his heir portioners of Different Marriages, they become Me-
ritual Debtors and Creditors to one another. In which case, if
such provisions exceed the estate, the question is whether they
are extinguished Confusions, or if they do all stand in Equity
to this, one having provided his lands to the heirs of three
several Marriages of each whereof there survived a Daughter

of which the first is a Debt to the second for seven Marks and the third for three Marks and the fourth for two Marks and the fifth for one Mark

the Lord admitted all the three sisters as heirs portioners and so
 Confound the provisions, not for the Heirs or assigned by Craig
 (Fined. lib. 2. fol. 19. § 10. viz. the fathers power to Dispose to
 his Children of a second or third Marriage, what he before had pro-
 vided to those of a former, which would have preferred the Daugh-
 ter of the last, but because all the provisions were equal and
 about the same thing, and so being either equally obliged to their
 as Representing the Deceased, the Disposition became void and in-
 effectual pro tanto. *lib. 3. fol. 8. § 15. vers. there is a case occur-*
reth. But since the Act of Parliament 1621 (Cap. 18. par. 2. §. 6.)
The Creditor by the first Disposition or provision may Recover
a posterior Disposition of the same thing to another of the heirs
portioners, as without a cause Sue void. Yet that will not hold
in Bonds for sums of Money; in which case when three bonds are
granted for equal sums to so many heir portioners, and these
bonds are Extinct Confusions, Debt and Credit line inde during
the same, but if three bonds of provision for unequal sums
are granted to so many heir portioners, which fourth, exceed the
value of the Substance of the Deceased: The provision of each
heir portioner becomes Extinct as to her proportion viz. a third
part, but she had Action as a Creditor for the third against the
other two heir portioners. P. S. The having an estate of 18000
Marks provided 15000 to his eldest daughter, 12000 to the second,
and 6000 to the third. The eldest inherited 6000 Marks of the re-
mainder of the Deceased as her legal part thereof, and had also the
second and third each of them bound to her for 5000 Marks as
their respective thirds of her provision, which being compen-
sated she gets Declaro 10000 Marks from the second, and 3000
Marks from the third, whereby she draws out of the estate 10000
Marks. The second daughter succeeded to 6000 Marks as her legal
third share of the estate, and had also the eldest and Youngest (each
of them bound to her for 4000 Marks as their respective thirds
of her provision; but she her self is liable to the eldest for 5000
Marks, and to the Youngest for 2000 Marks as the respective
thirds of their provisions, which being compensated, she gives to
the eldest 10000 Marks, and gets from the Youngest 2000 Marks
Declaro: whereby she draws out of the Estate 7000 Marks.
The Youngest Daughter succeeded to 6000 Marks as her legal
third part of the remainder of the Deceased, and had also the
eldest and second each of them bound to her for 2000 Marks
as their respective thirds of her provision: but she her self is
liable to the eldest for 5000 Marks, and to the second for
2000 Marks as the respective thirds of their provisions