

what is the rational for charging \$20 to repair a previously recalled/repaire...

Discussion Thread

Response (Laura)

6/12/2002 10:10:41 AM

Dear John,

The modification from a bolt-lock safety to a non bolt-lock safety is not a recall or a repair. This is an opportunity to upgrade at a discount.

Remington wanted to make people aware of the existence of the feature on the older guns and give a chance to upgrade. Mechanically, the safety is working the way it was designed.

When the rifle was first produced, most post WWII rifles were produced with the bolt lock safety, and (most) shooters were familiar with the feature. Now because firearm training is so different, and consumer demands have changed, we are providing an option for owners of pre '82 rifles to have the change made to their rifle and also to make people aware that the feature exists.

Customer (John Lang)

6/3/2002 3:57:24 PM

Laura,

Thanks for the response. However, I already understand the rules for repair

as you restated. What I don't understand is: If you believe/have a concern for an action that has the 'bolt-lock' feature and you INSTALLED that same bolt-lock feature as a result of a different recall issue - why I should have to pay to have it removed. Conversely, if you originally supplied the action with the same 'bolt-lock' feature, you will repair it at no cost. Why the difference?

The operative word in my original question was "rational."

Thanks,
John