

REV. 4-14
REMINGTON ARMS COMPANY, INC.

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

Remington



Exhibit 7

Bridgeport, Connecticut
September 15, 1980

TO: J. P. McANDREWS R. L. HALL
E. F. BARRETT H. K. BOYLE
J. P. GLAS J. P. LINDE
E. HOOTON, JR. C. B. WORKMAN
J. G. WILLIAMS J. E. PREISER

FROM: T. W. RAWSON *TWR*

SUBJECT: EXECUTIVE AUDIT - 1980

BACKGROUND

On September 9th an audit of 5 Model 1100's and 5 Smith & Wesson Model 1000's was performed by Remington management. Recent analysis by R & D and reports by Remington personnel making field trips had indicated that in a one-on-one comparison, the Smith & Wesson autoloader was an impressive competitor.

Instructions given to the auditors were to consider each shotgun as if it were being viewed in a retail store where only visual quality can be judged. It was interesting to note that after the first 2 to 3 pairs of guns were reviewed that this approach was abandoned by most auditors.

While it may be difficult to retain objectivity as a Remington employee, the more in depth review yields a fuller understanding of the problem. The notion that quality is every department's concern was once again demonstrated.

FINDINGS

The internal design from a safety and reliability viewpoint of the M1100 was found to be superior, with one exception. Many things that we take for granted and have not communicated to the marketplace for some time are clearly superior over the M1000. Things like ease of assembly and disassembly; ease of field stripping for maintenance and cleaning; safety factors such as a breech bolt which positively retains the locking block and a solid turned action bar sleeve instead of a sheet metal tube are sales features which Marketing can use to rebut S & W claims.

WIL04901