

Ilion, New York, January 14, 1946.

Reference is made to your report of January 9th. Under "Unfavorable Comments" on the test gun, we have the following to offer.

This item is being checked and will be corrected.

We are checking into this item but it is our belief that in any box magazine arm, the cartridges move forward and back with firing of the arm. This would be particularly noticeable on pointed cartridges which were allowed to remain in the magazine during some considerable period of firing. It is not unusual in cases of light magazine construction to have the forward end of the magazine so badly damaged that feed difficulties result after a period of time. In some cases, this movement of the cartridge has been known to cause breakage in the magazine or feed ramps. However, we will investigate this matter and advise you further.

We are unable to advise as to the stock finish situation until we have an opportunity to examine the gun. The finish applied to these test arms was the standard 500 Series lacquer finish, consisting of filling, staining, and spray lacquering. Until we have an opportunity of examining the arm, we cannot be certain of the cause of the difficulty.

R2500650

H. A. Brown

- 2 -

January 14, 1946

rifles are subjected to such severe usage and probably in general do not receive the care of the center fire arm. Had the 300 Series finish been inadequate, I presume we would have been subjected to considerable complaints hitherto now. Our only guess at this time is that the finish on the sample gun was in some respect not representative of the standard 300 Series finish. We will look into this matter and advise you.

Further reference is made to your letter of January 9th on the test firing of the .300 Nagam 1/2. At Mr. Nagle's request, this unit was returned to Springfield on January 9th for further examination and testing. We will be interested in the findings of this test.

*SH-111C*  
H. A. Brown  
Remington-Union  
Springfield, Mass.

000000