

By Declan Walsh

From [The New York Times](#) | Original Article

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan — A major parliamentary review of relations with the United States opened on Tuesday with calls for an end to drone strikes and for an unconditional apology for an American [attack that killed Pakistani soldiers](#) last November.

The demands, read to Parliament by the chairman of a cross-party national security committee, set a tough tone for a long-awaited debate that the United States hopes will bring a resumption of full diplomatic relations and the reopening of [NATO](#) supply lines through Pakistan.

“The U.S. must review its footprints in Pakistan,” said the five-page document, which read like a laundry list of Pakistani requests to the Obama administration. “No overt or covert operations inside Pakistan shall be tolerated.”

American hopes that the parliamentary review would conclude this week received a setback when the speaker adjourned the debate until Monday, ostensibly to allow the opposition to consider its position. There was another possible reason: Prime Minister Yousaf Raza Gilani is locked in a [bruising confrontation](#) with the senior judiciary that is due to resume in the Supreme Court on Wednesday and that could, under one possible outcome, lead to his resignation by the weekend.

Stressing that the United States should respect Pakistani “sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity,” the committee called on the Central Intelligence Agency to halt its drone strike campaign in the country’s tribal belt, which has resulted in at least 265 attacks since January 2008.

In the future, it added, there should be no American “hot pursuit or boots on Pakistani territory” — a possible reference to the raid that [killed Osama bin Laden](#) last May — and it

recommended tighter controls on foreign security companies operating in the country.

Pakistan's military and civilian leaders are hoping to leverage anger at the November shooting episode, in which American warplanes killed 24 soldiers in an exchange of fire along the northwestern border with Afghanistan, to gain concessions from the United States.

The committee called for a "thorough revision" of the agreement governing the 1,000-mile NATO supply route through Pakistan.

Pakistani officials say they intend to levy a transit tax on American military goods passing through their territory. The committee report suggested that half of all NATO traffic in the future be moved via the country's dilapidated railway network. The supplies are now transported by road.

The recommendations of the parliamentary review are not binding. But they are the product of cross-party consensus and will shape the mood of next week's debate, which is likely to last two or three days.

Some clauses acknowledged American concerns — the "elimination of terrorism and combating extremism," promotion of peace talks with the Afghan Taliban and strengthening security along the notoriously porous Afghan border.

But others stressed ties with American strategic rivals, like China and Russia, and called on President Asif Ali Zardari's government to "actively pursue" a planned gas pipeline from Iran — a project that Washington has strongly opposed.

"The recommendations are excellent," said Imtiaz Safdar Warraich, a senior Pakistan Peoples Party lawmaker, outside Parliament. "Sovereignty and territorial integrity are the cornerstone of our foreign policy."

Kamil Ali Agha, a senator from the Pakistan Muslim League-Q party, predicted a “very detailed and very lively” debate next week. “This is a very, very important issue for each and every Pakistani,” he said.

A resumption of full diplomatic relations with the Obama administration now looks unlikely before the middle of next month. American officials say they are ready to negotiate tariffs on NATO transit goods but will not consider an end to the C.I.A. drone campaign, which is viewed as a vital weapon against Al Qaeda and Taliban extremists operating from Pakistani soil.

The United States is also likely to offer a form of official apology, probably from the military, for the November airstrike. Plans to apologize earlier this month were shelved after controversy exploded in Afghanistan over the mistaken burning of Korans at [Bagram](#) Air Base.