

The Type II proposal has the advantage similar to Type I of eliminating the safety operation.

The economics of each trigger type are as follows:

| | Present Design | Proposed Type I | Proposed Type II | Proposed Type III |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Expenditures to Date | ----- | (\$3,000 on all Proposed Design) | | |
| Expenditures to Complete | ----- | \$21,330. | \$ 7,800. | \$12,900 |
| Standard Material | \$50.588/100 | \$34.105/100 | \$34.038/100 | \$29.358/100 |
| Standard Labor | \$25.268/100 | \$27.262/100 | \$29.238/100 | \$25.565/100 |

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the lack of additional complaints covering the question of the Model 721 firing when moving the safe to the "off" position and the inability to duplicate the complaints received from the field, we recommend that action be considered as follows:

1. Consideration be given to maintaining the current M/721 trigger "as is".
2. If a change is to be made to eliminate any remote theoretical possibility of the gun firing when moving the safe to the "off" position, we consider type I which in our opinion is the best design. Its disadvantages lay in the high expenditure required to make the conversion.
3. Consideration of the Type III design for the lowest product cost with adequate safety.
4. Last, the consideration of the Type II design. A "hard safety" would always be prevalent in this version as well as high product cost. This design is presented primarily to give Sales an opportunity to maintain their advertising feature of the safety (locking the firing pin

D. S. Foote
 D. S. Foote
 Design Unit
 Arms Technical Division

DSF:K.
 S/6/53