were: a requirement of papers to publish any statement furnished by the Social Credit Board "which has for its object the correction or amplification of any statement relating to any policy or activity of the Government of the province published by that paper within the next preceding 31 days"; and a requirement to name within 24 hours sources of any statement made in that paper within the preceding 60 days of the making of an order so to do, as well as to name the writer of any article, editorial, or news item appearing during the same period. Fines of $500 were provided for failure to comply with these conditions. The Act would also have empowered the Alberta Government to prohibit publication of newspapers contravening the provisions mentioned "for a definite time, or until further order", and to prohibit publication in any newspaper of the writing of "any person specified in the order". Contraventions of Orders in Council made under these provisions could bring a fine of $1,000.

Although Premier Aberhart had characterized the Act as a device "to restore freedom (of the press) from the clutches of financial, political and commercial organizations", Canadian journalists considered the legislation to have a much more hostile purpose. The press of Canada united under the late John M. Imrie of the Edmonton *Journal* to fight against the proposed measure. With Imrie as chairman, a committee was formed to oppose the Bill, and the late J. L. Ralston, K.C., was hired as legal counsel for the Alberta publishers. In Canada at large the Canadian Press and Canadian Daily Newspaper Association joined forces for the impending battle.

When Alberta's Lieutenant-Governor refused to give assent to the Press Bill, it became matter for court debate. In March 1938, the Supreme Court of Canada declared the Act *ultra vires* (beyond the power) of the Alberta Government, and in July of the same year it met final defeat when the judicial committee of the Privy Council refused to review it on the grounds that it was ancillary to the broader Social Credit legislation which the British body had previously ruled *ultra vires*. For the latter reason it is probably the verdict of the Canadian court that is significant. In handing down his decision, Chief Justice Lyman Poore Duff gave it as his opinion that "it is axiomatic that the practice of (the) right of free public discussion of public affairs, notwithstanding its incidental mischief, is the breath of life of parliamentary institutions".

The outcome was a distinct victory for newspaper liberty in Canada. For his part in the fight Imrie received, on behalf of the Edmonton *Journal*, a bronze plaque, the first Pulitzer award to go to a newspaper outside the United States. Five other dailies and 90 weekly newspapers of the province were given engraved certificates for their role in the victory.

A second Canadian controversy involving press freedom had its origin in an article entitled "Babies For Export". This appeared in the *New Liberty* magazine of Dec. 27, 1947. It described adoptions by outsiders of babies from the Province of Alberta. Publication of the article led to charges of "conspiring to publish a defamatory libel". These were laid against Jack Kent Cooke publisher of the magazine, the late Harold Dingman who had written the article, and Dr. Charlotte Whitton who had prepared the report on which the article was based.

The indignation aroused by the case arose from the fact that the defendants, who were all Ontario residents, were forced to travel 2,000 miles to an Edmonton courtroom to face trial. The Canadian Daily Newspaper Association, the Canadian Press, newspapers throughout Canada, and many others vigorously protested the Alberta action on the grounds that it was an attempt to avoid the plain meaning of Sect. 888 of the Criminal Code, which expressly stated that the place of trial in criminal prosecutions for libel against the publisher of a newspaper shall be within the province in which he resides or in which the newspaper is published. It was contended that, by making the charge one of 'conspiracy to publish' rather than one of 'libel' the attorney-general's department was destroying the protection for publishers which the Section was plainly intended to provide. Critics of the Alberta action saw in existing legislation a loop-hole in laws designed to guard press freedom.