

*Just
filed in info
Wayne back
for ans*

Development Department
Remington Arms Company, Incorporated
Bridgeport 2, Connecticut

Gentlemen:

In 1941, when I graduated from M.I.T., I tried to get a job with Remington. DuPont did offer me a position in one of the explosives plants; but Uncle Sam needed some fine second lieutenants, and off I went. As an aside, I have finally reached the exalted rank of lieutenant Colonel in the Artillery Reserve. I have thought it might have been too bad that I never did worm my way into some arms development operation.

Herewith a tracing from your advertisement in the May, 1963 issue of the RIFLEMAN. You will note that part of it is dotted in... the outline of the XP-100. I believe that I am aware of the general trend to "sell" new weapons and cartridges. I have been studying the things for about thirty years, and have owned and used almost two hundred different arms, both long and short.

The basic idea of the XP-100 appeals to me a great deal. I have wished that the rolling block Remington was more available for a long time. Well, gentlemen, why in the name of all that is holy did you chamber for the .221 instead of the .222? That bolt should safely hold any .222 ammo. Now we have another load to fool with. I do realize that powders for the .222 in a short tubed weapon would require some experimenting... as must those for the .222 shortened to .221. My sketch shows a suggested heavy tube, compared with that pencil you now have, and decent placement of the sights. I have talked with a lot of men about the XP-100. That front sight and rib, combined with that rear sight will "unsell" some people. It is fine to use the modernistic sights on weapons for the .22 long rifle trade, but I vote strongly for a usable sight radius when it is possible. And, it is downright foolish to bore four or five holes in any barrel, let alone such a slender tube, for the mounting of a die cast rib.

Well, that is part of it. I will probably sell of an old favorite to pay for an XP-100; and then go on the pay through the nose to have a decent barrel set on it chambered for the .222 which I use and of which I am most fond. Too bad you send prototypes out to the guys who write the tripe in the magazines... naturally, they will have little to say against anything by the recognized makers. I can not judge the Zytel stock. I am in the plastics section of the laboratory, and appreciate that molds cost a lot of money, and can not readily be altered in most cases. The basic idea of a plastic stock is sound from an engineering standpoint.

While I am writing, I would like to request that you send me a parts list with prices for the 722, 700 ADL and the 700 BDL. I do a bit of work on my arsenal, and would appreciate having the information for the maintenance of my Remingtons. I trust that this will not merit a form letter... like the one I recently received from Winchester... and they can go to blazes... I am changing over from the M70 to other rifles as fast as I can manage to do so.


Thanking you for your kind attention, may I remain

RECEIVED

MAY 6 1963


G. M. CALHOUN

249 El Conejo
Los Alamos, New Mexico
3 May 1963



XP-111

Heavier, slightly longer plain tube chambered for the .222 and fitted with sights set farther apart... Partridge type. Suggest testing something like the low Micro pistol sight on the rear end. Tap receiver for rings to suit a real handgun sight like the Nickel... those Bushnell's are ok for "cheapies", but not for a Smith & Wesson or an XP-111



HARTSHORNE
3 MAY 1963

Pierre F. Hartshorne
249 E1 Conejo
Los Alamos, New Mexico

