

cc: G.M. Calhoun
D.E. Miller
M.H. Walker - File

Ellic, New York
November 29, 1961

F. E. MORGAN
BRIDGEPORT

MODEL 700 - EXTRACTOR

Following our telephone conversation this morning, I have advised the Plant as to reports of relatively good progress and acceptance for the new models anticipated to be introduced in 1962.

We also discussed a continued desire for reconsidering the extractor problem. This was discussed to some extent during the meeting here at Ellic with the Regional Managers. I believe that you properly explained what is back of this suggestion as it relates to customer acceptance, but perhaps we have not properly apprised you folks with what will be involved to accomplish the objective.

First, it was suggested that we consider using the M/760 extractor and believe that field sales personnel were basing this upon the fact that there has been less trouble or complaints due to hand loading with this model. We pointed out earlier that the M/760 extractor was of the same type as the M/721 but assembled a little differently in the bolt head, using a rivet for attachment. I believe this was done to provide a more positive orientation, recognizing the relatively small ejection port as compared to the bolt action. However, our people feel certain that if we were simply to add the rivet assembly for the extractor in the bolt action model, we still would not accomplish the desired result. And after adding additional cost and effort, there appears to be another reason to explore the difference with the M/700 hand loader's experience. This was mentioned over the telephone and may be elaborated further if desired.

In reviewing with the Plant this morning, find that considerable quantity of M/700 bolt heads have already been processed. It may or may not be feasible to add the M/760 extractor without reprocessing additional components.

Next it was pointed out to us that because of the larger diameter 7 mm Mag. cartridge head there is very little material left in the bolt shroud to accommodate any counterbore for an extractor rivet. Believe this also will apply to Caliber 264, but not necessarily a problem in the 30-06.

F. E. Morgan

-2-

November 29, 1961

We next talked about what would be involved if we were to "throw out" present extractor design and go to a claw type extractor. This would require scrapping the present production plans as scheduled, allowing several weeks for design, plus about a week for model making, and then followed by design testing. Assuming this is successful, the Plant would have to retool for making the change, all of which would probably add up to a delay of at least 3 months.

In addition to changes to the bolt head it would also require changes to the receiver. I believe we also pointed out that it would necessitate a withdrawal of our claims as to the exclusive we now hold regarding comparative strength of the action, all of which is tied in with the totally shrouded head. Believe you understand this but are of opinion that Sales feels such a change may still be necessary to overcome existing adverse experience, and that we would be willing to accept the risk of greater hazard from hand loading accidents.

We advised the Ilion Plant not to stop on their present pilot operations since this is simply exploratory, but to be prepared for possibility of any change growing out of the discussion at Sales Meeting.

S. M. Alvis
Ilion Research Division

SMA:T