

CC: R.H.Coleman
 D. Godfrey
 G.E.Pinckney
 G. Evans

R.C.Swan
 G.C.Lambert
 C.W.Roney

J.D.Mitchell
 G.M.Calhoun
 H.A.Brown
 W.L.Clay

7/21
sig. Pinckney - 7/21/50

MINUTES OF MEETING
SUBSTITUTE CALIBER FOR WINCHESTER .270

At the meeting of the Operations Committee (Arms Division) held at the Iliion Plant on May 11, 1950, G. E. Pinckney suggested that recommendations be made to Management for the elimination of the .270 Winchester caliber for the Models 742-762 on account of the imperfections of that particular cartridge and to avoid further delay in development of these rifles. Furthermore, that we develop a new cartridge of Remington design ballistically superior to the .270 Winchester for adaptation to these particular models. It was also suggested that we must keep in mind that the particular cartridge developed to replace the .270 Winchester may afterwards be adapted to the Model 721. All of the aforesaid discussion pertained to the Arms Development Schedule dated April 18, 1950 which had been presented for approval.

As a result of this disoussion, a meeting was held at 2:30 P.M. in the office of G. E. Pinckney on May 23, 1950 for a determination of Sales opinion on the particular type of cartridge desired. Those present were;

D. Godfrey	C. W. Roney
G. E. Pinckney	J. D. Mitchell
G. Evans	G. M. Calhoun
R. C. Swan	H. A. Brown
G. C. Lambert	W. L. Clay

G. E. Pinckney conducted the meeting and pointed out that as a general proposition it is desirable to make a new rifle for an existing cartridge that is already popular and widely accepted by the shooting public. However, in this instance, while the .270 Winchester cartridges of Remington make are perfectly satisfactory, yet those of Western-Winchester make are very ununiform, particularly with respect to pressuros, and will not operate dependably in the Model 742 Autoloading Rifle and quite likely will give trouble in the Model 762. Therefore, it becomes necessary to eliminate considoration of the .270 Winchester caliber in the Models 742-762 and to develop a more dependable Remington cartridge equal or superior to the .270 for these new modols. Naturally, we cannot bring out new rifles that will not handle all makos of cartridges in any spocified caliber.

G. E. Pinckney also pointed out the importance of getting the new type of cartridge at the earliost practical date as he stated that there had already been a delay of about four months in the devolpment of the Models 742-762 due to im-perfections of the Winchester .270. He reviewed the complaints against this cart-ridge due to the fact that the Winchester drawings of the chamber submitted to SAAMI did not correspond to the actual guns made and, therefore, the ammunition furnished by Winchester gave high pressuros not only in their own rifles but in those pro-duced by others. He stated that Winchester had considerable trouble with their own line in this caliber and field reports have indicated that many of their cartridges have had to be returned due to high pressuros and complaints of customers. On the other hand our own cartridge of the .270 Winchester type has been satisfactory in

our own rifles and in those properly chambered by competitors. Apparently Winchester launched this cartridge not only to exploit their own name but also to compete with the 30-06 which shooters were able to obtain at reduced prices through the Director of Civilian Marksmanship. He felt, therefore, that Remington should now exploit its own cartridge for these new models provided we can develop one which is equal or better in characteristics to the .270 Winchester and which can be sold on a competitive basis with respect to price. He mentioned the great success in launching the .222 cartridge for the Model 722 and felt that Remington could likewise popularize a new cartridge to compete with the .270 Winchester. He felt that the advertising of the rifle would help greatly in the introduction of the new cartridge and that we would get all of the ammunition business pertaining to the new models for a considerable period of time and may adversely affect sales of the Winchester .270 caliber rifles.

After giving a summary of considerations of other calibers, such as the .276, .280, and .284, with 7 m/m types of bullets, G. E. Pinckney requested the viewpoints of others present;

R. C. SWAN stated emphatically that he had been against the introduction of new arms of Remington design in competitors' types of ammunition. He reviewed the past considerations of the .280 and stated at the time of those experiments that it had not been adopted previously because it did not show marked superiority over the .270 Winchester and in some respects was inferior. He felt, however, that a cartridge labeled with a Remington name should be developed for use in the Models 742-762 in lieu of the .270 Winchester type. He indicated that we should have a Bronze Point and a Pointed Soft Point Core Locket bullet in the caliber selected. At this point G. E. Pinckney stated that we probably should not go above .280 caliber as, for example, the sales of the .300 Magnum caliber rifles are comparatively small and furthermore we need a new cartridge to compete with the .270 Winchester at the same price. In addition, calibers larger than .280 cannot be used as the receiver is not sufficiently large to accommodate a cartridge of such length.

J. D. MITCHELL indicated he was strongly in favor of a new Remington cartridge to replace the .270 Winchester for those new models of rifles provided there was no danger of interchangeability with the .270 Winchester type. G. M. Calhoun indicated that the design of cartridge case would be such as to eliminate any such danger.

G. EVANS opened his discussion by setting forth a few questions:-

1. What assurance had we that Winchester or Western would make the new cartridge any better than they do the present .270 Winchester?
2. Will the .280 or approximate caliber be adaptable to different bullet weights to the same extent as the .270 now available in the Winchester type?
3. Will the .280 be safer since it is a larger caliber and will it present the same difficulties that now prevail in the .270 Winchester type?
4. Are there any other calibers more adaptable; for example, if we are going to use lighter weight bullets then shouldn't we take a good look at lower calibers?

G. M. CALHOUN indicated that S.A.A.M.I. specifications for the new cartridge would eliminate the troubles now encountered with the .270 Winchester in answer to G. Evans' question #1 and if adhered to like any other cartridge, would not give trouble.

With respect to the adaptability of different bullet weights, G. M. Calhoun stated that it depended upon which way we wanted to go. If we wanted to go toward higher bullet weights, then there was a possibility of encountering higher pressures. However, since it was the consensus of opinion that the bullet weights should be preferably 130 and 150 grains with possibly 110 or 100 grain bullets for varmint shooting, there should be no pressure difficulties. G. M. Calhoun also added that a .280 or approximate caliber would give greater latitude for development and that he felt such a type of cartridge could be produced within a reasonable time not only to meet the favorable characteristics of the .270 Winchester but also to be competitive in price.

G. C. LAMBERT expressed himself in favor of the .280 but felt that it should develop a higher velocity than the .270 Winchester and have better characteristics to add prestige to the Remington and Peters lines.

C. W. RONEY was in agreement that a new cartridge approximating .280 should be developed to equal or exceed the performance of the .270 and sell at a competitive price basis.

D. GODFREY thought that lower calibers - .267 or .276 - with 120 to 140 grain bullets in the .267 and 130 to 150 grain bullets in the .276 might be given consideration. However, he felt that a cartridge approximating the .280 would be satisfactory and was willing to go along with that suggestion.

R. C. STAN added to his remarks by stating that he did not agree with Mr. Godfrey's suggestions for going below .270 caliber and he felt that we should have a new cartridge approximating 7 m/m which we might call the Remington .275. G. E. Pinckney agreed fully with this suggestion.

H. A. BROWN pointed out the study that he had made some years ago wherein he emphasized to Management the large number of cartridges in the catalogue which were labeled under names of competitors. He felt that careful consideration should be given to the fact that new cartridges will add to the number now produced and also increase the items in the gun line. He agreed, however, that it was desirable to initiate exploratory experimental work to find a satisfactory substitute for the .270 rather than continue with efforts to adapt the Models 742-762 to the present .270.

After a full discussion of the various considerations involved in the development and launching of a new cartridge, it was finally agreed among the Sales group as follows:-

1. All were in accord that the .270 Winchester caliber should be given no further consideration for the Models 742-762.
2. All agreed that the Technical Department should strive to produce a new cartridge at the earliest practicable date strictly competitive with the .270 Winchester for price and performance characteristics.

3. That performance should preferably be better than the .270 Winchester and should involve equal or better muzzle and sustained velocities, accuracy, functioning and safer pressures. Pressures preferably should not exceed 50,000 p.s.i. The cartridge should be of a rimless type and bullet weights should be 100 to 110 grains for varmint shooting and a 130 grain Bronze Point and a 150 grain Pointed Soft Point Core Locket.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was pointed out that Management recently approved a change in the model numbers of the 742 and 762 to read 740 and 760. This change will be announced in an Operations Committee Informative Bulletin as soon as an official transmittal of the Management Staff Meeting decision is received by the Secretary of the Operations Committee.

W. L. Clay
W. L. Clay

WLC:VPD
5/24/50