LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY REVIEW COMMISSION,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

The AMERICAN INDIAN POLICY REVIEW COMMISSION,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sirs and Madam: The task force on Federal, State and tribal jurisdiction presents to you this report pursuant to Public Law 93-580. The report contains the task force's findings and recommendations in some of the major areas of current jurisdictional conflict.

Before this report is published in final form, the task force urges that all Indian tribes and organizations, as well as other interested parties, be given the opportunity to review and comment on the report. It had been the intention of the task force to do this; however, limitations of time precluded such review.

With the above indicated caveat, we urge your consideration of the facts presented, and your good efforts in ensuring implementation of the recommendations made.
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