After the delegates expressed an opinion on the future of Canadian participation in NATO (Table No. 7), NORAD renewal (Table No. 16), support for peacekeeping operations (Table No. 19) and the effect of UNEF's withdrawal of future Canadian peacekeeping (Table No. 20) they were asked to state which of the three foreign policy activities was the most important to continue if Canada only had the military and financial capability to support one of the three.

Table No. 24 - Priority support for NATO, NORAD and Peacekeeping among Delegates to the annual CIIA meeting, June, 1967.

Question: If Canada only had the military and financial capability to support one of the following foreign policy activities - NATO NORAD, or peacekeeping - which would you consider most important?

	Total	Occupational groups					
	sample	M	F	1	2	3	, 4
Peacekeeping	53.2	50.0	61.1	54.5	51.8	52.9	50.0
NATO	26.5	28.3	22.2	27.3	22.2	29.4	30.0
NORAD	15.2	16.7	11.1	18.2	18.5	11.8	10.0
No answer	<u>5.1</u>	5.0	5.5	<u> </u>	7.4	5.9	10.0
Totals #'s	100.0 (79)	100.0 (60)	99.9 (18)	100.0 (22)	99.9 (27)	100.0 (17)	100.0 (10)

Occupation code: 1. academics, 2. professionals, 3, interested citizens, and 4. civil servants and communication people.

As might be expected peacekeeping was considered most important by the majority of respondents. Of the total sample 53.2% felt peacekeeping was most important compared to 26.5% for NATO and 15.2% for NORAD. The same pattern of support existed for both male and female delegates, and for all occupation groups. Obviously the pessimism that has been expressed by academics writing about peacekeeping in the last several years has not had any affect on the delegates to the CIIA meeting. The results in this table support the contention that peacekeeping has become more acceptable than NATO and NORAD. Unfortunately, the Canadian Institute of Public Opinion has not investigated this question, and no comparisons can be made with the general public.

Another area of interest is the extent to which Canadians would like Canada to follow a more independent foreign policy, and whether this policy should be non-aligned. On this point the CIIA delegates showed an ambivalent attitude when compared with their support patterns for NATO and NORAD. While a clear majority also adopted for a more independent type of foreign policy.