New Blog Series: Understanding Quebec v Senneville

We're delighted to announce the publication of a series of three expert interviews on the Supreme Court of Canada's recent judgment in *Quebec v Senneville* — a judgment that elicited a great deal of public attention and controversy when it was released in October 2025.

In *Senneville*, the Supreme Court struck down two mandatory minimum sentencing provisions relating to possession and accessing of child pornography, ruling that these sentences violated section 12 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In reaching this conclusion, the Court used the "reasonable hypothetical" approach that has become a standard part of its mandatory minimums jurisprudence, reasoning that the statutory minimum sentence of one year in prison would be grossly disproportionate if applied, for example, to an otherwise law-abiding 18-year old receiving a second hand sext from a 17-year old.

In this series of interviews, Kira Davidson, Public Legal Education Coordinator with the CCS, spoke to Professors Lisa Kerr, Steven Penney, and Emmett Macfarlane about different aspects of the Court's judgment and Parliament's reaction to it. You can access all three of these posts by clicking the links below:

Interview 1: Lisa Kerr

Interview 2: Steven Penney

Interview 3: Emmett Macfarlane