

...The Canadian Bee Journal

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

NEW SERIES
VOL. XI, No. 1.

BRANTFORD, ONT., AUGUST, 1903.

WHOLE No
462

Ontario Bee-keepers' Association

ANNUAL MEETING

Honey from Capped and Uncapped
Comb.

By F. T. SHUTT, M. A.,

Chemist, Experimental Farms, Ottawa

The investigation into the nature of honey from uncapped comb— which we have termed here unripe or immature honey—was begun, as some of you will remember, in the season of 1901. Almost at the outset of the work we found difficulty. We endeavored to determine by chemical analysis the difference in composition between honey taken from full capped combs and that taken from comb which was only partially, and that altogether uncapped. I supposed from what I had learned that the difference, if any, would be chiefly in the proportion of water held by or contained in the honeys. Consequently, my first endeavor was to make an examination of these three classes of honey in order to get the moisture percentages. That is where our difficulty lay. I found almost at once that the results were extremely variable; and by employing the methods of analysis that were then in vogue the

data were altogether unreliable. When I attended your convention last year at Woodstock, I could only present to you data of a tentative character. I could only give indications, and say in which direction I thought our work was pointing; but I was not prepared to say that immature or unripe honey was such and such as regards its moisture content. I did, however, say two things: I stated, or aimed to indicate, that immature or unripe honey contained more moisture, probably between two and five per cent; and there was another thing I felt pretty certain about, and that was that the published percentages of water in our honey as they had appeared in a government bulletin some two or three years ago were unfortunately unreliable. I remember I went into the discussion rather fully, and gave you the arguments, and my reasons for coming to that conclusion that those results were altogether too high—not all of them, but a very large number of them, were to high in their water content. Of course it was not intentional, as I pointed out at the time I said the analysts whose work was represented in that report were good and true men, but that the methods which had been employed were not such as would rightly estimate the moisture, and the reason for that was that too high a temperature was being employed: that the high drying temperature really meant