

DON'T SAY IT-WRITE IT

To R. E. FIELTZ Location _____ Phone _____
From E. F. BARRETT Location _____ No. _____
Subject _____ Date 1/23/84

I ran across a fellow at the SHOT Show who had some ideas on our firearms.

- He suggested we convert from plastic to steel on the ejection port cover of the Model 6 and 7600 pump action rifles.
- He suggested we look at a new rifling approach on bolt action rifles. Apparently Heckler & Koch has a rifling layout which is less susceptible to fouling, easier to clean, and higher velocity. See if you can get me some more information on this.
- He suggested that we develop a new cartridge for the Model 7400, a 9.3X64 Brenneke. He says it will deliver performance equivalent to the 375 H&H Magnum. He says he has checked our receiver dimensions and believes we can accommodate without major design changes. (As you may know, one of the major competitive disadvantages we have had with our autoloader is that it will not accommodate magnum calibers, whereas the Browning gun will).
- He says that in the changes we made to the Model 760 when we developed the Model 7600, we did not add a swivel attachment to the fore-end. He claims he's heard a number of complaints about this and that we could accommodate a swivel attachment without a major change.
- He suggests we offer an extra capacity magazine box for the Model 7400 in our parts list. (This gets back to the paramilitary issue we talked about earlier in the year). I have no objection to a 10 or 15 round magazine box. I think there are several outfits making large capacity magazine boxes now for the Model 7400.

EFB:y
EFA

RD 778 A

STOP, LOOK, AND LIVE

- I. Conversion of the M/6 - 7600 ejection port covers from plastic to steel: the original 740/760 rifles had steel covers. They were changed to a synthetic in 1957. Although the D.C.R. changing the specs does not state the reasons for change, I can guess what some might be:
1. Too noisy.
 2. Too expensive, i.e., secondary operations after blanks — polish, buff, color.
 3. Because the part was steel and cycles with the bolt, it would scratch and bare metal would be exposed which is unsightly. Also might rust.
 4. As in #2, fabrication by molding out of colored synthetic (nylon, delrin) is much preferable economically than blanking, polishing, and coloring.
- II. Rifling: The polygonal rifling idea has been discussed as an alternative to our present system. We are investigating this approach.
- III. New cartridge for 7400, i.e., magnum type: 'receiver dimensions' are not the issue here. I would say common sense plays a large part in the decision not to pursue a 'magnum type' 7400. I fully realize that the Browning Co. has a 7mm magnum in the BAR line. This does not necessarily make it a desirable quality. The 7mm magnum, 375 H&H, and I would suspect, the Breneke use slower burning powder and, as such, would generate greater pressures at unlock and extraction. The Browning's orifice is situated further down bore than ours. Simply stated: it would entail some major design changed to accommodate this or other magnum type cartridges. Is the effort worth it?
- IV. Swivel attachment 760/7600: the early M/760 fore-end/action bar design was different than the later M/760 and 7600. The action tube on this early 760 was fixed: that is, the fore-end moved back and forth over this tube in a manner similar to an 870. Therefore, it was possible to tap the cap on the end of this type and attach a swivel. A design change made this impossible to continue attaching in this manner. The later 760 used a barrel band attachment, the same as the 7600 does now. It would seem impractical to locate the swivel on a fore-end that moves back and forth as you shoot, thereby flopping the sling around.

I personally have never heard any complaints about this method of attachment.

- V. Extra capacity magazine for the 7400: R&D has tested at least two different extended round magazines made for the 742/7400. Neither magazine performed satisfactorily. Not only were the boxes lacking in design, but in execution of design.

A little less than a year ago, design for an extended capacity magazine in .223 was completed and vendors contacted. The design was quite a bit different in approach and probably would have contributed much to our knowledge of a larger magazine. The contact with the vendors would have been invaluable. However, the project is now inactive.

I believe an extended box should be designed and manufactured differently than the two boxes mentioned before. I also believe it should be made of lightweight material, aluminum, or perhaps molded like the Israeli made M/16 magazine. I also believe it should hold the action open after the last round is fired.

A. R. Eddy:ws

2-8-84