Office of the
Conflict of Interest and
Ethics Commissioner

Commissariat aux
conflits d'intérêts et
à l'éthique

Idlout Report

2026

Hon. Konrad von Finckenstein, C.M., K.C.

Conflict of Interest and
Ethics Commissioner

September 2026

Idlout Report
made under the *CONFLICT OF INTEREST CODE FOR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS*

For more copies of this document, please contact:

Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner
Parliament of Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0A6

Email: info@cie.parl.gc.ca
Telephone: 613-995-0721

Ce document est également publié en français.

This document is also online at EthicsCanada.ca.

092026-128E

PREFACE

The *Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons* (Code) constitutes Appendix 1 of the *Standing Orders of the House of Commons*. Under section 27 of the Code, a request for an inquiry may be made by a Member of the House of Commons who has reasonable grounds to believe that another Member has not complied with their obligations under the Code.

The Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner is required to forward the request to the Member who is the subject of the request and to afford the Member 30 days to respond. The Commissioner then has 15 working days to conduct a preliminary review of the request and the response and to notify both Members in writing of the Commissioner's decision as to whether an inquiry is warranted.

Following the completion of an inquiry, which must be conducted in private, a report is to be provided to the Speaker of the House of Commons, who tables it in the House of Commons when it next sits. The report is made available to the public once it is tabled or, if the House is not then sitting, upon its receipt by the Speaker.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of my inquiry under the *Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons* (Code) into the conduct of Ms. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament for Nunavut, in relation to expenses she made in 2024 and 2025 that were charged to her Member's Office Budget.

The expenses included five instances of gifts given as a matter of protocol Ms. Idlout had purchased from a business she owns, and one instance in which Ms. Idlout had obtained accommodations from her spouse's bed and breakfast while on official travel in her riding.

The inquiry focused on section 8 of the Code, which prohibits Members, when performing parliamentary duties and functions, from acting in any way to further their private interests or those of a member of their family, or to improperly further another person's or entity's private interests.

The circumstances in which a Member's actions are considered to further theirs or a person's private interests for the purposes of the Code include those where a Member's actions increase or preserve the value of their own assets or that person's assets.

I determined that, by claiming expenses made at a business she owns and another owned by her spouse, Ms. Idlout contravened section 8 of the Code as the benefit to her and her spouse's respective businesses ultimately came from an expenditure of funds provided to her through her Member's Office Budget.

When I find that a contravention of the Code has occurred, I must consider whether there are any mitigating factors and whether to recommend a sanction.

Since Ms. Idlout had not received any income from the business she owns in several years and was not involved in managing it, she did not consider that purchases made there for legitimate parliamentary purposes would further her private interests. With respect to the expenses made at her spouse's bed and breakfast, she and her staff stayed there for lack of another option.

In my view, Ms. Idlout made an error in judgment in good faith because it never occurred to her that her actions would result in the furthering of private interests.

I recommended that no sanction be imposed given that Ms. Idlout reimbursed all of the claimed expenses immediately after the concerns were brought to her attention. In my view, this demonstrated a true desire on Ms. Idlout's part to fully rectify each of her past non-compliances.

CONCERNS AND PROCESS

[1] In a letter to me dated March 14, 2026, Mr. Michael Barrett, Member of Parliament for Leeds–Grenville–Thousand Islands–Rideau Lakes, requested an inquiry under the *Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons* (Code) into the conduct of Ms. Lori Idlout, Member of Parliament for Nunavut.

[2] In his letter, Mr. Barrett wrote that Detailed Contract Expenditures Reports published on the House of Commons' website listed four expenses claimed by Ms. Idlout for the purchase of gifts given as a matter of protocol at Carvings Nunavut Inc. Mr. Barrett noted that, according to Ms. Idlout's disclosures on this Office's public registry, she is this business's sole owner and, according to federal incorporation records, its sole director.

[3] Mr. Barrett alleged that, by using funds from her Member's Office Budget to make purchases from a business she owns, Ms. Idlout may have contravened section 8 of the Code, which prohibits Members from acting in any way to further their private interests when performing parliamentary duties and functions.

[4] On March 18, pursuant to subsection 27(3.1) of the Code, I forwarded a copy of Mr. Barrett's letter to Ms. Idlout and provided her with 30 days to respond to the allegations.

[5] Having received no response at the end of the 30-day period, I wrote again to Ms. Idlout on April 22 to notify her that I had determined, based on the information before me, that an inquiry into the matter was warranted.

[6] Ms. Idlout responded on May 12, providing the information and documents I had requested in relation to the four purchases raised by Mr. Barrett.

[7] I held an interview with Ms. Idlout on June 2. On June 5, she provided additional information and documents on matters raised during her interview, including an additional claimed expense for gifts given as a matter of protocol and certain claimed travel expenses.

[8] Based on information provided in respect of a claim for travel expenses made at a business owned by her spouse, I notified Ms. Idlout on June 9 that I had reasonable grounds to believe that she may not have complied with her obligation under section 8 of the Code not to further the private interests of a member of her family when performing parliamentary duties and functions. As I was including an additional allegation to the scope of the inquiry, in accordance with subsection 27(7) of the Code, I invited Ms. Idlout to provide additional representations, at her discretion, in respect of all matters under inquiry.

[9] Ms. Idlout was provided with an opportunity to review the transcript of her interview and other documents, and to comment on a draft of the factual portions of this report (Concerns and Process, Facts, Issues and Ms. Idlout's Position) before it was finalized.

FACTS

Background

[10] Ms. Idlout was first elected as the Member of Parliament for Nunavut in the general election of September 20, 2021, and re-elected on April 28, 2025.

[11] Early in each Member's mandate, during what is referred to as the initial compliance period, Members are informed of their obligations under the *Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons* (Code), both generally and specifically in relation to their situation. The information and advice provided at that time typically include an overview of the Code's substantive conflict-of-interest rules. In Ms. Idlout's case, this was provided verbally in a call with her assigned compliance advisor on May 10, 2022, and in a letter sent electronically on May 16, 2022.

[12] Subsequently, throughout their time in office, Members can also seek advice from their advisor in the Office on any matters relating to their compliance with the Code. In December 2022, Ms. Idlout consulted the Office regarding a specific matter. In notes prepared after the call, Ms. Idlout's advisor wrote the following: [TRANSLATION] "I also advised her she could not purchase gifts from the indigenous art gallery she owns with her Member's Office Budget. She was very much aware of this."

[13] Asked about this at the interview we held in the context of this inquiry, Ms. Idlout testified that she remembered the call and the advice she was given on the main topic of the call, but she did not recall the additional advice provided in respect of her art gallery.

Ms. Idlout's ownership of Carvings Nunavut Inc.

[14] The disclosure regime under the Code requires all Members to approve a summary statement of their private interests, which is posted on the Office's public registry. Ms. Idlout's summary statement includes a mention that she is the sole owner of Carvings Nunavut Inc., a retail art gallery located in Iqaluit, Nunavut. The publicly available corporate profile for the business indicates that it was incorporated in February 2009 and that Ms. Idlout is the sole director of the corporation.

[15] During her interview, Ms. Idlout confirmed that she has been Carvings Nunavut Inc.'s sole shareholder and director since she created the business. According to her, the purpose of the business is to buy and sell Inuit art in order to support the Inuit economy, in particular by helping Inuit artists generate an income from their work. The gallery sells art pieces such as carvings and prints, as well as other types of crafts including wall hangings and clothing made by Inuit. Ms. Idlout also explained that the gallery has recently started carrying items such as magnets and t-shirts that have Inuit art printed on them.

[16] Ms. Idlout testified that she hasn't been making any decisions regarding the operations of the business since she started law school in 2014. When she was involved in operations, the gallery would purchase art pieces directly from the artists for resale, rather than selling pieces on consignment. She could not confirm in her interview whether this is still the practice, but she also wasn't aware of any change in this regard.

[17] According to Ms. Idlout, the difference between the sale price for the art and the amount that was paid to the artist goes to fund the operations of the business, including staff salaries, rent for the gallery's space and several bills such as telephone and internet, as well as payment terminal fees. Asked what happens if there is a surplus, Ms. Idlout stated that those funds remain in the business to be used for the purchase of more Inuit art. Ms. Idlout testified that she has received no income from Carvings Nunavut Inc. since before she was elected.

Ms. Idlout's claims for certain expenses

[18] Members are entitled to a budget to be used in the fulfillment of their parliamentary duties and functions for expenses such as employee salaries, rent for their constituency office, equipment and supplies, subscriptions, professional services or costs associated with hosting events. Members and their staff are also reimbursed for travel for parliamentary purposes, and the person a Member selects as their designated traveller (typically their spouse) can also be reimbursed for travel to be reunited with the Member.

[19] The various types of expenses are subject to conditions and limits that are set out in the *Members By-law* and explained in detail in the *Members' Allowances and Services Manual*. Under these rules, Members can charge gifts given as a matter of protocol in the context of the Member's parliamentary duties or functions to their Miscellaneous Expenditures Account, which covers both hospitality and gifts and represents 3% of their Member's Office Budget. The maximum value of a gift charged to this account is $150, and Members can offer gifts in specified circumstances, for example in recognition of a person or organization's achievement or contribution to the community, or to a civic leader or visiting dignitary as a matter of protocol.

[20] Expenses claimed by Members for reimbursement by the House are listed in three detailed expenditures reports relating to travel, hospitality and contracts, published every quarter for each Member on the website of the House of Commons.[1]

[1] Members – Summary of Expenditures

[21] Ms. Idlout described the process followed in her office for making purchases and claiming expenses for reimbursement by the House during her interview. She testified that, other than certain expenses incurred by her staff during travel, she personally makes all purchases herself, in particular with respect to the gifts she buys to be given as a matter of protocol. She then provides the receipts to her staff along with information on the nature and purpose of the purchase, for them to prepare the claims for reimbursement in the House of Commons' financial portal.

[22] Ms. Idlout testified that she approves every claim before it is submitted, and she confirmed that the information she sees in the portal at that time is essentially the same information that is then published in the public quarterly expenditure reports. Once a claim has been processed by the House Administration, Ms. Idlout (or, as the case may be, the staff member who incurred the expense) receives the reimbursement.

Purchases at Carvings Nunavut Inc.

[23] According to the Detailed Contract Expenditures Reports published on the House's website, since being elected in 2021, Ms. Idlout claimed a total of 13 expenses in the "Gifts given as a matter of protocol" category: 3 in 2022, 2 in 2023, 2 in 2024 and 6 in 2025. The total amount spent by Ms. Idlout on these purchases was $5,740.46. Of these purchases, 10 were made from vendors in Nunavut, including the 4 described below that were listed as having been made at Carvings Nunavut Inc.[2]

[24] On January 13, 2025, Ms. Idlout purchased a wall hanging for a price of $150, in advance of travelling the next day to Rankin Inlet, Nunavut, to attend a ceremony for the completion of the Kivalliq Long-Term Care Elders Centre. The wall hanging was offered as a gift to the institution on that occasion.

[25] On January 15, 2025, Ms. Idlout purchased a lapel pin for a price of $150, which she gifted to the Honourable Greg Fergus, the Speaker of the House of Commons at the time, during an official visit to Iqaluit.

[26] On June 25, 2025, Ms. Idlout purchased a fridge magnet, a bar of artisanal soap and a tumbler cup for a total of $76. These items were gifts for the Honourable Rebecca Chartrand, Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs, to be offered during her visit to Iqaluit on June 27, 2025.

[2] All of the amounts cited exclude applicable taxes, which is how they appear in the Detailed Contract Expenditures Reports.

[27] On August 27, 2025, Ms. Idlout purchased a number of items (cards, tote bags, hand-crafted keychains and zipper pulls, and sculptures), for a total of $1,380. These items were gifts for First Nations leaders, Elders and invited speakers she would be meeting during the New Democratic Party's national caucus meeting of September 9 to 11, 2025, in Parksville, British Columbia.

[28] Ms. Idlout confirmed in her interview that, in all four of the above cases, she selected the items in the gallery, made the purchases herself and, per her usual process, had her staff prepare the claims for reimbursement, which she approved in the House's financial portal before they were submitted.

Purchase at "Tumiit"

[29] One of Ms. Idlout's purchases for "Gifts given as a matter of protocol" listed in the Detailed Contract Expenditure Report for the first quarter of 2024-2025 was made on April 27, 2024, at a supplier identified as "Tumiit." According to publicly available information, "Tumiit Plaza" is the name of the building where Carvings Nunavut Inc. is located in Iqaluit.

[30] I asked Ms. Idlout about this purchase at her interview. As she had no recollection in respect of this expense claim, she undertook to provide any information and documents she could find in relation to it.

[31] According to two invoices provided by Ms. Idlout, the items purchased on April 27, 2024, were a sealskin tie and a traditional carving, each with a value of $150. The first invoice mentions that the item was purchased as a gift to be given as a matter of protocol. The second invoice mentions that the item was purchased as a gift for the retirement of Nunavut's Chief Justice Neil Sharkey. In the written submissions accompanying the documents, Ms. Idlout stated both items were gifts for Mr. Sharkey.

[32] While the two invoices provided for the purchase at "Tumiit" do not identify the seller as Carvings Nunavut Inc., their layout is in every way identical to that of the invoices provided in relation to purchases listed as having been made at Carvings Nunavut Inc., which also do not identify the seller.

Expenses claimed for travel to Igloolik

[33] Members may use resources provided by the House for travel taken by the Members themselves and their eligible employees in fulfillment of their parliamentary duties and functions. Members can also claim travel expenses for one designated traveller, typically their spouse, as well as dependants. Travel expenses that can be claimed for reimbursement include those for transportation, meals and accommodations.

[34] As evidenced in the Detailed Travel Expenditures Reports published on the House of Commons' website, since becoming the Member of Parliament for Nunavut, Ms. Idlout has regularly travelled to communities in her riding to attend events where she and members of her staff meet with and serve her constituents. Ms. Idlout made claims for travel to the hamlet of Igloolik in Nunavut on three occasions in 2025: a trip from February 24 to 26, a stop on a tour of her riding for the night of March 4 to 5, and a trip from August 15 to 19.

[35] As part of Ms. Idlout's initial compliance process under the Code following her re-election in 2025, she disclosed that Al's B&B Inc., a business wholly owned by her spouse that provides short-term accommodation, owns real property in Igloolik. Based on publicly available information, I found that the Igloolik location of Al's B&B Inc. started offering accommodations to the public in late 2024.

[36] During her interview, I asked Ms. Idlout whether she had claimed any travel expenses for stays at Al's B&B Inc. in Igloolik. Since she could recall one such instance, I asked her to provide to me all available documents and information relating to travel expenditure claims for accommodations during the three trips taken to Igloolik in 2025.

[37] The documents Ms. Idlout provided show that on February 14, 2025, ahead of a tour she took of her riding in March with two staff members, her assistant contacted the hotel in Sanirajak, a small community about 70 km from Igloolik where the Member would be holding an event on March 4. The assistant was told, however, that there would be no rooms available there that night. It was therefore decided that, after the event in Sanirajak, the group would continue on to Igloolik to spend the night of March 4 to 5. On March 1, the assistant first attempted to book rooms in a hotel in Igloolik, but was told it was fully booked. As a result, the group stayed one night at Al's B&B Inc. in Igloolik, which had rooms to accommodate them.

[38] Other documents Ms. Idlout provided show that, during the trips to Igloolik of February and August 2025, Ms. Idlout and those accompanying her did not stay at Al's B&B Inc. in Igloolik.

Ms. Idlout's repayments to the House of Commons

[39] On March 16, 2026, Ms. Idlout was contacted by a journalist who asked her about the purchases made at Carvings Nunavut Inc. in 2025, as listed in the Detailed Contract Expenditure Reports, in light of her declared ownership of the business. Ms. Idlout responded as follows on March 18: "The expenditures referenced were for indigenous artwork, used in my capacity as MP. They were submitted in error and I have subsequently reimbursed the House of Commons for the total value."

[40] In her response to my letter of April 22, 2026 initiating this inquiry, Ms. Idlout provided documents showing that, on March 18, 2026, she repaid the House for the claimed expenses for the gifts purchased at Carvings Nunavut Inc. on January 13, January 15, June 25 and August 27, 2025.

[41] Along with the additional information and documents I had requested during her interview, Ms. Idlout also provided documents showing that, on June 4, 2026, she repaid the House for the claimed expenses made at "Tumiit" on April 27, 2024 and the three rooms for herself and her two staff members at Al's B&B Inc. in Igloolik for the night of March 4 to 5, 2025.

ISSUES

[42] The issues to be addressed in this inquiry are as follows:

a. Did Ms. Idlout further her own private interests when performing parliamentary duties and functions, contrary to section 8 of the Code, by making purchases from a business she owns and charging those expenses to her Member's Office Budget?

b. Did Ms. Idlout further the private interests of a member of her family when performing parliamentary duties and functions, contrary to section 8 of the Code, by obtaining accommodation while on official travel at a business owned by her spouse and charging that expense to her Member's Office Budget?

[43] Should I conclude that Ms. Idlout did not comply with her obligations under the Code, it must then be determined whether any of the mitigating circumstances listed at subsection 28(5) apply, and if not, whether I should recommend any appropriate sanctions.

MS. IDLOUT’S POSITION

[44] At the time she made the purchases at issue in this inquiry, Ms. Idlout did not view them as contravening her obligations under the Code.

[45] The items purchased were mostly handmade by local Inuit artists from her constituency and given as gifts as a matter of protocol to visiting dignitaries and invited First Nations leaders. Proceeds from purchases made at Carvings Nunavut Inc. are used to support the arts community in Nunavut and the business’s basic operations. While she remains an owner of Carvings Nunavut Inc., she has been removed from its day-to-day operations and decision making, and she has not received any income from the business since before being elected.

[46] When Ms. Idlout realized she had committed an error in claiming these expenses, she immediately wanted to correct it and repaid the full amounts to the House of Commons as soon as she could. Ms. Idlout stated that she did not have any bad intentions and was not trying to take advantage in any way.

[47] With respect to the claimed expense for accommodations in Igloolik in March 2025, Ms. Idlout noted that accommodation options in Nunavut, particularly its hamlets, are very limited. Regarding the night in question, because no accommodations were available in the hamlet where her constituency event was being held, she and her staff were required to travel to nearby Igloolik and stay at her spouse’s bed and breakfast due to a lack of other available options.

ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSION

Analysis

[48] This inquiry examined claims for reimbursement by the House of several expenses made by Ms. Idlout in 2024 and 2025. The expenses examined included purchases for gifts given as a matter of protocol and expenses relating to travel to Igloolik, a community in Ms. Idlout's riding.

[49] The purpose of this inquiry was to determine whether Ms. Idlout, in respect of these claims, contravened section 8 of the *Conflict of Interest Code for Members of the House of Commons* (Code), which reads as follows:

> **8.** When performing parliamentary duties and functions, a member shall not act in any way to further his or her private interests or those of a member of the member's family, or to improperly further another person's or entity's private interests.

[50] In each case, the claimed expenses were made in the exercise of Ms. Idlout's parliamentary duties and functions.[3] The gifts purchased at Carvings Nunavut Inc. were offered in the context of a community event, of visits to her riding by federal officials, of a parliamentary caucus meeting and of the retirement of a local dignitary. The accommodations at Al's B&B Inc. in Igloolik were required in the context of a tour of Ms. Idlout's riding for the purpose of meeting with stakeholders and constituents. Ultimately, the expenses were considered by the House Administration as admissible to be charged to Ms. Idlout's Member's Office Budget and reimbursed to her per regular processes.

[51] The initial allegation was that, by making purchases in a business she owns and claiming the expenses for reimbursement by the House, Ms. Idlout furthered her own private interests. A second allegation added in the course of the inquiry was that, by paying for accommodations at a business owned by her spouse and claiming the expense for reimbursement by the House, Ms. Idlout furthered the private interests of a member of her family.[4]

---

[3] The Code defines Members' parliamentary duties and functions at subsection 3(1) by incorporating the definition of "parliamentary functions" of the *Members By-Law* of the House's Board of Internal Economy, which are "the duties and activities that relate to the position of Member, wherever performed and whether or not performed in a partisan manner, namely, participation in activities relating to the proceedings and work of the House of Commons and activities undertaken in representing his or her constituency or constituents."

[4] A Member's spouse or common-law partner is listed as a member of their family at subsection 3(4) of the Code.

[52] Subsection 3(2) of the Code identifies the circumstances in which a Member's actions are considered to further a person's private interests for the purposes of the Code. Among the enumerated circumstances, paragraph (a) establishes that "an increase in, or the preservation of, the value of the person's assets" furthers that person's private interests.

[53] The shares of Carvings Nunavut Inc., all of which are owned by Ms. Idlout, constitute an asset for the purposes of the Code. This business operates a gallery that primarily sells pieces of Inuit art. As Ms. Idlout explained, profits leftover from the costs of acquiring stock and running operations are used to acquire more stock, which furthers the business's purpose and activities. Every sale made by Carvings Nunavut Inc. thus contributes to preserving or growing its value and, by the same token, to the value of Ms. Idlout's asset. The fact that the Carvings Nunavut Inc.'s activities benefit Inuit artists by creating a market for their work does not change the fact that they also generate a profit for the business.

[54] Similarly, Al's B&B Inc., which is wholly owned by Ms. Idlout's spouse, is in the business of renting short-term accommodations, and every booking contributes to the business's bottom line and to the value of Ms. Idlout's spouse's asset.

[55] As Ms. Idlout explained, the expenses at issue were initially paid for by the Member herself. While it may not be recommendable for Members to deal with a business they own in the fulfillment of their parliamentary duties and functions, there may be no contravention of the Code if the costs of those transactions are borne by the Member personally. The result of Ms. Idlout's claiming the expenses for reimbursement, however, was that the benefit to the two businesses involved ultimately came from an expenditure of funds provided by the House.

Conclusion

[56] The facts gathered in this inquiry are clear and unchallenged. I conclude that, by claiming for reimbursement expenses made at a business she owns and another owned by her spouse, Ms. Idlout contravened section 8 of the Code.

SANCTION

[57] Having concluded that a Member has not complied with an obligation under the Code, I must consider whether the contravention is mitigated in any of the ways listed in subsection 28(5) of the Code, which reads as follows:

> **28. (5)** If the commissioner concludes that a member has not complied with an obligation under this code but that the member took all reasonable measures to prevent the non-compliance, or that the non-compliance was trivial or occurred through inadvertence or an error in judgment made in good faith, the commissioner shall so state in the report and may recommend that no sanction be imposed.

[58] In the case at hand, I cannot find that Ms. Idlout took all reasonable measures to prevent the non-compliances. On several occasions, Ms. Idlout obtained protocol gifts from other vendors and she did not put forward a reason for which she would have opted on five occasions to make purchases at her own art gallery. With respect to accommodations in Igloolik, I note that options are limited, and in the case of the March 2025 trip, Al's B&B Inc. had the only ones available. Ms. Idlout, however, could have consulted the Office on the matter before making her claim for reimbursement. Had Ms. Idlout sought advice, an appropriate way to deal with the exceptional circumstances could have been found. The Office exists precisely to provide Members with advice on how to avoid situations that may potentially benefit their private interests.

[59] I also cannot find that the non-compliances were trivial, considering the number of times a non-compliance occurred.

[60] For a non-compliance to have occurred through inadvertence, the contravening Member would have to have been unaware of at least one of the elements of the contravention. This could not have been the case here since Ms. Idlout knowingly purchased items in her own business and paid for rooms in her spouse's bed and breakfast, and later personally approved claims for reimbursement of these expenses. No aspect of any of the non-compliances transpired without her knowledge.

[61] Finally, in making a determination on whether a Member's non-compliance occurred through an error in judgment made in good faith, I may consider the Member's statements regarding their state of mind at the relevant time, in addition to any information relating to the circumstances.

[62] In an earlier exchange with her advisor in the Office, Ms. Idlout had acknowledged understanding how the rule under section 8 of the Code would apply specifically to the use of House resources in her art gallery. While she stated in her interview that she had no recollection of that exchange, she also made no claim of being unaware of the rule. In any event, I am compelled to note that ignorance of an applicable rule cannot be invoked as a mitigating factor, especially one as fundamental as the rule of conduct at play in this case.

[63] While Ms. Idlout had knowledge of the applicable rule, she made the error of allowing other considerations take precedence over a strict observation of the rule in each circumstance. Ms. Idlout had not received any income from Carvings Nunavut Inc. in several years and was not involved in managing the business. As a result, she did not consider that the purchases she made there for legitimate parliamentary purposes would further her private interests. With respect to her travel to Igloolik, Ms. Idlout's approach by default was not to stay at her spouse's accommodation facilities. The lack of another option in one instance unfortunately did not prompt her to treat the claim for reimbursement differently.

[64] In my view, Ms. Idlout erred in judgment because it never occurred to her that her actions would result in the furthering of private interests. It was an error made in good faith.

[65] I must also account for the fact that Ms. Idlout repaid the House for the amounts she had claimed quickly after the matter of the purchases made at Carvings Nunavut Inc. was brought to her attention by a journalist. She did the same when additional concerns were brought up during her interview, namely a fifth purchase made at her gallery and the booking at Al's B&B Inc. In my view, this demonstrates a true desire on Ms. Idlout's part to fully rectify each of her past non-compliances.

[66] In consideration of the above, I recommend that no sanction be imposed for Ms. Idlout's contravention. She made an error of judgment in good faith, which has been fully remedied.

The Honourable Konrad von Finckenstein, C.M., K.C.
Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner

September 2, 2026