

in such a case. . . . In a case being tried by the Master upon a reference to him for that purpose, there should not be an appeal upon every interlocutory ruling.

On the merits, the ruling of the Master was right in each instance. The question put by counsel for plaintiffs to the witness R. W. Farley and disallowed by the Master was in form wrong. It was stated on the argument that the witness under examination is the person who, as between plaintiffs and defendants, is to interpret the contract. He may be asked what he did in reference to the work done or omitted, or what he said to plaintiffs in reference to the contract or work done or to be done. It is objectionable to ask this witness the meaning of any clause in the contract and still more objectionable to ask him what a clause "was intended to mean."

Appeal dismissed with costs to defendants in the cause.
