



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

PROTECTING CANADIAN RESIDENTS FROM EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS

**Report of the Standing Committee on Environment and
Sustainable Development**

Shannon Miedema, Chair

**JUNE 2026
45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION**

Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Standing Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website
at the following address: www.ourcommons.ca

**PROTECTING CANADIAN RESIDENTS FROM
EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS**

**Report of the Standing Committee on
Environment and Sustainable Development**

**Shannon Miedema
Chair**

JUNE 2026

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

NOTICE TO READER

Reports from committees presented to the House of Commons

Presenting a report to the House is the way a committee makes public its findings and recommendations on a particular topic. Substantive reports on a subject-matter study usually contain a synopsis of the testimony heard, the recommendations made by the committee, as well as the reasons for those recommendations.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

CHAIR

Shannon Miedema

VICE-CHAIRS

Ellis Ross

Patrick Bonin

MEMBERS

Carol Anstey

David Bexte

Bruce Fanjoy

Wade Grant

Will Greaves

Branden Leslie

Chris Malette

Eric St-Pierre

Tim Watchorn

OTHER MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT WHO PARTICIPATED

Marc Dalton

Ted Falk

Amanpreet S. Gill

Angelo Iacono

Steeve Lavoie

Dane Lloyd

Gurbux Saini

Kristina Tesser Derksen

CLERK OF THE COMMITTEE

Leif-Erik Aune

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT

Alison Clegg, analyst

Sarah Houle, analyst

Sarah Yakobowski, analyst

THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

has the honour to present its

SEVENTH REPORT

Pursuant to its mandate under Standing Order 108(2), the committee has studied protecting Canadian residents from extreme weather events and has agreed to report the following:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS	1
PROTECTING CANADIAN RESIDENTS FROM EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS	5
Introduction	5
The Problem: Extreme Weather Events In a Changing Climate	7
Terminology	9
Mounting Insurance and Recovery Costs Resulting from Extreme Weather Events	11
Flood Risk, Costs and Insurance	15
Beyond Financial Costs: Health and Social Impacts of Extreme Weather Events	17
Shaping the Solutions: Government of Canada’s Actions Related to Extreme Weather	19
Mitigation Versus Adaptation Funding	20
An Ounce of Prevention: The Financial Benefits of Climate Change Adaptation Investments	22
Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund	22
First Nations Adaptation Funding Gaps	25
Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements	25
Support for First Nations Following Extreme Weather	27
Potential Public Reinsurance in Lieu of the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements	28
Canada’s National Adaptation Strategy	28
National Flood Insurance Program	30
Ensuring Resiliency in Future Development	31
Flood Mapping	32
Nature-Based Solutions	34
Conclusion	35

APPENDIX A: LIST OF WITNESSES	39
APPENDIX B: LIST OF BRIEFS	43
REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE	45
DISSENTING OPINION OF THE CONSERVATIVE PARTY OF CANADA	47
SUPPLEMENTARY OPINION OF THE BLOC QUÉBÉCOIS	51

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of their deliberations committees may make recommendations which they include in their reports for the consideration of the House of Commons or the Government. Recommendations related to this study are listed below.

Recommendation 1

That the Government of Canada reaffirm its commitment to the *Paris Agreement* and thus to meeting its greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, and acknowledge that failing to meet these targets would be a factor of increase in extreme weather events. 35

Recommendation 2

That the Government of Canada encourage and work with the financial sector to adapt to climate change and that the Government of Canada ensure its contribution to the adaptation efforts of organizations and individuals. 35

Recommendation 3

That the Government of Canada make immediate and strategic reinvestments in the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund and work with provinces and territories to address local climate change adaptation needs. 36

Recommendation 4

That the Government of Canada provide financial, technical, and human resources to First Nations to support the development, implementation, and monitoring of emergency management strategies, action plans, and risk assessments. 36

Recommendation 5

That the Government of Canada strengthen First Nations' financial, technical, and human capacity to conduct climate change assessments and monitoring at the community level. 36

Recommendation 6

That the Government of Canada continue to use green bonds to support the growth of the sustainable finance market in Canada and help support investments in climate adaptation. 36

Recommendation 7

That the Government of Canada work in concert with provincial and territorial governments, while respecting their respective jurisdictions, to ensure that its own climate change adaptation actions are consistent with those already being taken in the various provinces and territories. 36

Recommendation 8

That the Government of Canada establish an insurance program that would allow everyone to obtain affordable insurance against recurring natural disasters. 36

Recommendation 9

That the Government of Canada work with other jurisdictions and the private sector to support and amplify existing public awareness campaigns that promote the implementation of adaptation measures at the household level. 36

Recommendation 10

That the Government of Canada continue to develop and regularly assess its National Adaptation Strategy. 37

Recommendation 11

That the Government of Canada improve its process for identifying issues, objectives, and targets, and continuously monitor progress on climate change adaptation. 37

Recommendation 12

That the Government of Canada integrate climate resilience into public infrastructure funding by ensuring that all public infrastructure funding systematically takes climate risks into account and helps infrastructure owners reduce their long-term vulnerability. 37

Recommendation 13

That the Government of Canada adopt a comprehensive approach to integrating climate change adaptation into infrastructure management, specifically in the planning, operation, maintenance, and renewal of public infrastructure, to ensure that it continues to function safely and reliably under future climate conditions. 37

Recommendation 14

That the Government of Canada follow through on its commitment to support home renovations that promote sustainability and resilience and ensure that best practices for adaptation are incorporated into the design, construction, upgrading, and management of buildings and infrastructure, including natural infrastructure. 37

Recommendation 15

That the Government of Canada support any initiative to certify the resilience of buildings; such certifications would send a strong signal to the market, helping to maintain insurability and access to mortgage financing. 37

Recommendation 16

That the Government of Canada elevate the urgency of emergency management to reflect the increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events. 37

Recommendation 17

That the Government of Canada adopt a “whole-of-society” approach to emergency management, recalibrating the integration of systems to enable greater coordination, collaboration, and efficiency. 38

Recommendation 18

That the Government of Canada launch a national flood insurance program informed by flood mapping which accurately reflects risk in flood-vulnerable areas. 38

Recommendation 19

That the Government of Canada continue to prioritize funding climate adaptation, addressing aging infrastructure, and incentivizing building back better in the interest of long-term economic efficiency and improved outcomes following natural disasters.

38

Recommendation 20

That the Government of Canada create a national emergency management agency to strengthen emergency management in Canada, coordinate emergency management entities, address capacity gaps, and increase efficiency in deployment and resource management.

38

Recommendation 21

That the Government of Canada promote the building of resilient, climate-ready homes and infrastructure, and encourage retrofitting and upgrades for older homes and infrastructure.

38



PROTECTING CANADIAN RESIDENTS FROM EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS

INTRODUCTION

The damage caused by extreme weather events has been growing in Canada. The Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction estimates that the cost of extreme weather damage has been increasing by over 9% per year for several decades.¹ 2024 was a record-setting year, with insured losses reaching \$9.4 billion² and total damage costing \$13 billion.³ Insured losses, however, do not tell the full story of the impacts of extreme weather events on Canadians – there are also economic losses, health and public safety risks, and the strain of evacuations, displacements, and recovery.

Climate change is contributing to increasingly frequent and severe extreme weather events,⁴ including floods, droughts, wildfires, hailstorms, hurricanes, tornadoes, and atmospheric rivers.⁵ The Co-operators Group warns that “extreme weather is no longer a rare occurrence, but a recurring national risk with significant implications for housing, infrastructure, economic growth, and affordability.”⁶

-
- 1 House of Commons, Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development (ENVI), [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1110 (Sophie Guilbault, Director of Partnerships, Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction).
 - 2 Co-operators Group, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), March 2026.
 - 3 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1110 (Sophie Guilbault).
 - 4 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1640 (Kiera Taylor, Senior Policy Analyst, Investors for Paris Compliance); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1535 (Kenza El Bied, Director General, Policy and Outreach, Emergency Management Branch, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1530 (Andrew DeFazio, Director, Risk Management, Strategy and Products, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1715 (Jason Jacques, Interim Parliamentary Budget Officer, Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer); Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.
 - 5 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1535 (Janice Myers, Chief executive officer, Canadian Real Estate Association); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1120 (Louise Wallace Richmond, Councillor, City of Salmon Arm, British Columbia, Federation of Canadian Municipalities); Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026; General Insurance OmbudService, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), undated, published 3 March 2026.
 - 6 Co-operators Group, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), March 2026.



On 6 October 2025, the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development (the committee) agreed to study the impact of extreme weather events on Canadian residents by adopting the following motion:

That, [g]iven that severe weather damage cost over \$7 billion in the summer of 2024 in insured losses alone, and given that insured losses don't adequately represent all public economic losses, the committee undertake a study, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), on the role of the federal government alongside the insurance industry, provinces and territories, municipal governments, and other key partners in finding a financially sustainable path forward for protecting each and every resident of Canada from the impacts, risks and actual costs, of extreme weather events exacerbated by climate change, including their impacts on public finances and household costs; that the [c]ommittee dedicate at least four (4) meetings to this study and that the committee report its findings and recommendations to the House; and pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request the government table a comprehensive response to the report; and, that the study begin following witness testimony on the study of the electric vehicle availability standard.⁷

During the study, the committee heard from 28 witnesses over four meetings between 8 December 2025 and 26 February 2026 and received eight written briefs.⁸ The committee is grateful to all the witnesses and authors of briefs who shared their perspectives and insights. Their contributions informed the committee's recommendations to the Government of Canada, which are found in this report.

This report contains two sections: the first outlines the problem of extreme weather and the second discusses possible solutions presented by witnesses. The first section begins by explaining the connection between extreme weather events, climate change, and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. It then discusses rising insurance and recovery costs, partly due to increasingly frequent and severe extreme weather events (particularly floods). Finally, the section sheds light on the sometimes-overlooked health and social impacts of extreme weather events.

The second section begins by discussing the benefits that may flow from funding climate change adaptation. It then explores disaster financial assistance arrangements and

7 ENVI, [Minutes of Proceedings](#), 6 October 2025.

8 ENVI, [Protecting Canadian Residents from Extreme Weather Events](#).

suggests some improvements. Next it outlines the case for a national flood insurance program. The section then discusses Canada’s National Adaptation Strategy, the benefits of funding adaptation, and Canada’s further adaptation funding needs, including through the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund and for First Nations. The section concludes with recommendations for improving the extreme weather resiliency of future development (e.g., buildings and infrastructure), including through the use of nature-based solutions.

THE PROBLEM: EXTREME WEATHER EVENTS IN A CHANGING CLIMATE

“For everyday Canadians, climate change isn't a percentage point or a bar graph. It is a devastating and increasingly common extreme weather event with real consequences.”

Janice Myers, Chief executive officer, Canadian Real Estate Association,
ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1535.

Many witnesses⁹ made statements similar to that of Jason Jacques (Interim Parliamentary Budget Officer, Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer), who said that “[c]limate change is increasing the frequency and severity of severe weather events.”¹⁰ According to Alain Bourque (Executive Director, Ouranos),

the science is clear: Climate change is generating significant increases in the frequency, intensity, duration and scale of weather events and several types of extreme weather events in all parts of Canada. This trend will continue until global net zero is achieved. What this means is that there are two ways to address the problem. First, reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Second, learn to live with the unavoidable impacts of climate change.¹¹

9 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1640 (Kiera Taylor); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1530 (Andrew DeFazio); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1535 (Kenza El Bied); Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026; ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1645 (Alain Bourque, Executive Director, Ouranos).

10 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1715 (Jason Jacques).

11 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1645 (Alain Bourque).



The committee heard how the number of wildfires and area burned have increased in Canada, affecting air quality and emitting carcinogenic pollutants.¹² The committee also heard how the northern regions of Canada are warming approximately 3–4 times faster than the global average.¹³ Some impacts of climate change – including extreme weather – are illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1—Climate change impacts and challenges to which different regions of Canada must adapt



Source: Government of Canada, [Canada's National Adaptation Strategy](#), 2023.

Kiera Taylor (Senior Policy Analyst, Investors for Paris Compliance) specified that GHGs released by burning fossil fuels are responsible for climate change and its extreme

12 Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, "Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government," received 19 March 2026.

13 Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

weather impacts.¹⁴ She felt it was contradictory of insurance companies to raise concern about rising costs from climate change while they continue to invest in or insure fossil fuel companies. Ms. Taylor stated:

It is definitely a contradiction within their business models. In 2023, the top seven Canadian [property and casualty insurance] companies, or their parent companies, invested over \$19.5 billion in fossil fuels.

Fairfax Financial, a Canadian-headquartered global insurer, is the third-largest insurer of fossil fuels globally. It is investing in and funding the causes of the need for increased adaptation and contributing to the pressure that the industry is facing because of extreme weather.¹⁵

She added:

[B]y continuing to underwrite and invest in fossil fuels, they're contributing to the need for increased adaptation and resilience. Unfortunately, in the conversations with the business leaders in the insurance industry, there is a reluctance to focus on emissions reductions and that part of climate risk management. [... O]verall, there is a focus on adaptation as opposed to emissions reductions.¹⁶

Terminology

Throughout the study, the witnesses used a variety of terminology to describe Canada's changing weather, including extreme weather events, severe weather, natural disasters, natural catastrophes, natural hazards, catastrophic risks, extreme climate events, weather-related emergencies, climate disasters, climate-driven events and environmental perils.¹⁷ A 2025 United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction report asserted that the continued use of the term "natural disaster" is misleading as "a hazardous future is not inevitable."¹⁸ In its brief, the Assembly of First Nations stated likewise: "it is important to

14 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1640 and 1705 (Kiera Taylor).

The connection between burning fossil fuels, greenhouse gas emissions, climate change, extreme weather events and insurance needs is elaborated upon in a report cited by Kiera Taylor: Investors for Paris Compliance, [Climate Damages & Canada's Looming Home Insurance Crisis: Who Pays?](#), November 2025.

15 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1705 (Kiera Taylor).

16 *Ibid.*, 1730.

17 E.g., Federation of Canadian Municipalities, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026; ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1535 (Kenza El Bied); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1105 (Susan Penwarden, Managing Director, Personal Lines, Aviva Canada).

18 United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction, [Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction, Resilience Pays: Investing and Financing for Our Future](#), 2025.



underscore that these unprecedented increases in extreme weather events are the direct result of human-induced climate change and are therefore preventable.”¹⁹

Andrew DeFazio (Director, Risk Management, Strategy and Products, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation) explained that an event is considered “catastrophic” when it reaches a certain dollar amount in damage,²⁰ and Matthew Hoffarth (Assistant Director, National Economic Accounts Division, Statistics Canada) stated that a catastrophic event is one for which insurance claims reach \$30 million.²¹ Statistics Canada explained how it distinguishes between extreme weather and extreme climate events, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1—Comparison of Statistics Canada definitions of extreme weather events and extreme climate events

Feature	Extreme Weather Event	Extreme Climate Event (or Climate Event)
Timescale	Hours → days → (sometimes weeks)	Weeks → months → seasons
Nature	Individual incidents (e.g., storm, downpour, heatwave)	Persistent pattern of extremes (e.g., multi-month drought, multi-season heat anomaly)
Definition Basis	Rarity at a specific time/place	Sustained departure from climate norms over longer periods
Examples	Tornado, flash flood, cold snap, heat dome	Prolonged drought, months-long heat anomaly, multi-season rainfall deficit

Source: Reproduced from Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons’ Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, “Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government,” received 19 March 2026.

19 Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

20 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1615 (Andrew DeFazio).

21 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1705 (Matthew Hoffarth, Assistant Director, National Economic Accounts Division, Statistics Canada).

Mounting Insurance and Recovery Costs Resulting from Extreme Weather Events

The committee heard about rising insurance claims and premiums, as well as other recovery costs from extreme weather events.²² In its brief to the committee, the Insurance Bureau of Canada illustrated the increasing trend of annual insured catastrophic losses in Canada.²³

Statistics Canada explained, “when there is an extreme weather or climate event ... there are many impacts that are recorded both explicitly and implicitly within our statistical system. For example, disruption to business’ activities and lost wealth when property is damaged or destroyed.”²⁴ A description of how costs of extreme weather are captured in Statistics Canada data is provided in Table 2.

Table 2—Summary of extreme weather and climate events by key macroeconomic component as they are represented in Statistics Canada data

Macroeconomic component	Potential impact of extreme weather or climate events
Compensation of employees	Gains and losses in wages and salaries depending on occupation and situation (i.e., overtime for first responses, fewer hours worked for employees of businesses that must scale back production or close temporarily).
Business incomes and production	Events can curb or halt production of goods and services by businesses in affected areas resulting in lower corporate incomes from temporary or permanent closures. Some sectors, such as Accommodation and food services, may experience an increase in output given the need for temporary shelter and meals depending on the number of displaced persons moving from an affected area to an unaffected one.
Household expenditures	Shift in composition of expenditures from discretionary to necessary ones, especially when related to temporary needs due to displacement (i.e., accommodation and food services).

22 E.g., ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1240 (Craig Stewart, Author, As an individual); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1240 (David Leibl, Vice President, Sustainability & Corporate Affairs, Wawanesa Mutual); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1130 (Susan Penwarden).

23 Insurance Bureau of Canada, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

24 Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons’ Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, “Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government,” received 19 March 2026.



Macroeconomic component	Potential impact of extreme weather or climate events
Wealth	When an event occurs, there may be immediate destruction of fixed assets held by households (i.e., dwellings), businesses (i.e., non-residential buildings) and governments (buildings and infrastructure). Given the size of the stock of fixed assets in Canada, these impacts [may] not be readily identifiable at the national level. For example, at the end of 2024, the replacement-cost of all residential and non-residential structures in Canada was roughly \$7.1 trillion dollars. There may also be a reduction in other assets or increased debt to manage temporary expenditures or replace uninsured items.
Capital investment	Events that cause destruction and damage to Canada’s capital stock result in increased capital investment and construction activity due to demolition, clean-up and re-building, whether by the private or public sector. This may take place soon after the event or much later and continue well into the future. However, these future activities likely involve a different set of people, whereby economic growth may not necessarily translate into jobs or increased income for those originally affected.
Government expenditures	Within government expenditures, the impact of natural disasters can be reflected in several categories. There can be increased final consumption expenditure, including higher wages in response to natural disasters, increased social transfers in kind in healthcare services and other support measures, and increased intermediate expenses, such as spending on emergency supplies, contracted services, and cleanup operations. There can also be increased capital expenses, such as investment in machinery and equipment used for response and recovery activities and replacement of damaged public infrastructure.

Source: Reproduced from Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons’ Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, “Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government,” received 19 March 2026.

Statistics Canada outlined the impact of extreme weather events on private insurance and government costs, as well as on individuals:

Insurance companies [...] make claim payments every quarter through the normal course of business and these payments are shown as transfers to households and businesses. However, after extreme events, insurance claims can grow significantly. Losses can be specific to certain insurers given they may be more exposed to a particular region although there is geographic diversification of risk when insurers operate in many different jurisdictions. Nationally, for every dollar covered by private insurance, governments incur costs related to disaster relief and infrastructure repair

and uninsured losses must be absorbed (i.e., write-offs or replacement using own funds).²⁵

Statistics Canada pointed out that the “homeowners’ home and mortgage insurance consumer price index (CPI) has largely outpaced all-items consumer price index since 2020, peaking at 9.7% in January 2022 and again in August 2023.”²⁶ The data show that “for most of the period from 2013 to 2025, the homeowners’ home and mortgage insurance index in the CPI has outpaced all items inflation.”²⁷ Statistics Canada attributed these increases to “more frequent weather events, high construction and rebuilding costs, and reinsurance costs.”²⁸ A breakdown of cost increases over time in homeowners’ home and mortgage insurance by province is shown in Table 3.

Table 3—Consumer price index – Homeowners’ home and mortgage insurance cost increases over time, between 2005 and 2025, in Canada and by province

Province	12-month % change (Dec 2024–Dec 2025)	5-year % change (Dec 2020–Dec 2025)	10-year % change (Dec 2015–Dec 2025)	20-year % change (Dec 2005–Dec 2025)
Canada	+5.3%	+38.6%	+69.7%	+174.4%
Newfoundland and Labrador	+11.4%	+19.9%	+61.3%	+137.3%
Prince Edward Island	+5.8%	+26.7%	+40.2%	+91.3%
Nova Scotia	+11.4%	+43.1%	+75.8%	+235.1%
New Brunswick	+4.9%	+28.9%	+55.5%	+162.0%
Quebec	+3.2%	+30.8%	+62.4%	+80.6%
Ontario	+3.7%	+36.5%	+67.5%	+185.3%
Manitoba	+7.0%	+46.7%	+70.7%	+136.6%
Saskatchewan	+5.7%	+40.9%	+77.6%	+283.9%
Alberta	+12.2%	+55.8%	+83.6%	+391.6%
British Columbia	+2.2%	+37.4%	+72.0%	+133.6%

25 Ibid.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.



Source: Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, "Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government," received 19 March 2026.

Note: Data by territory was not provided.

Insurance costs were shown to represent a higher percentage of disposable income for the lowest income Canadians (15.3%) than for the highest income Canadians (6.6%).²⁹ According to Statistics Canada's 2023 the Households and the Environment Survey, "23% of households had been affected by an extreme weather event or natural disaster in the past 12 months," such as poor air quality, strong winds, extreme temperatures, storms, and wildfires.³⁰

Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada was asked by the committee if it considered risk scenarios and costs under different scenarios of global warming. It responded:

Public Safety's Data Science and Engineering Team conducts quantitative risk assessments, including climate impacts and financial risk, using Canada-wide flood hazard models and several different data sources. The team has provided technical support for two recent published reports investigating the impacts of climate change on disaster costs:³¹

- [Bank of Canada]'s 2023 report, *Climate-Related Flood Risk to Residential Lending Portfolios in Canada*;³² and
- Canadian Climate Institute's 2025 report, *Close to Home: How to Build More Housing in a Changing Climate*.³³

One of these reports, *Climate-Related Flood Risk to Residential Lending Portfolios in Canada*, estimated lenders' annual expected risk from flooding to residential properties under two climate change scenarios – 2 degrees Celsius and 4 degrees Celsius of warming above the pre-industrial baseline – by the year 2100. Compared to current levels of losses, average annual losses were estimated to increase by 6.7% by the year 2100 under a 2

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid.

31 Public Safety Canada, Written Response to Questions submitted to ENVI, 10 February 2026.

32 Ibid., [Bank of Canada, *Climate-Related Flood Risk to Residential Lending Portfolios in Canada*, 2023].

33 Public Safety Canada, Written Response to Questions submitted to ENVI, 10 February 2026; [Canadian Climate Institute, *Close to Home: How to Build More Housing in a Changing Climate*, February 2025].

degrees Celsius warming scenario. Average annual losses were estimated to increase by 11.9% under a 4 degrees Celsius warming scenario.³⁴

Flood Risk, Costs and Insurance

The committee was informed that, of all extreme weather events, flooding is the costliest in Canada.³⁵ Furthermore, damage from flooding is projected to increase due to climate change and due to development in high-risk areas.³⁶ Kenza El Bied (Director General, Policy and Outreach, Emergency Management Branch, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness) informed the committee that Canada did not have an overland flood insurance market prior to 2015.³⁷ Overland flood insurance “covers damages caused by excessive rainfall or snowmelt, overflowing lakes, rivers and other freshwater sources entering the home.”³⁸ Although she recognized the progress made by the insurance industry since then in providing coverage to many households, she noted:

At the same time, provinces, territories and municipalities have indicated that coverage is becoming more expensive and often does not fully meet recovery needs. More importantly, the remaining protection gap is concentrated where it matters most. Private overland flood insurance is largely available in low- to medium-risk areas, presenting roughly 10% of overall flood risk. Meanwhile, about 90% of flood risk is concentrated in high-risk areas, where potentially up to one million Canadian households remain unable to obtain adequate coverage.³⁹

Andrew DeFazio of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which is a technical partner in developing a national flood insurance program, further commented on households in those high-risk areas:

About 10% of households are uninsurable or severely under-insured, yet account for 90% of total flood risk, potentially representing modelled losses of about \$1.5 billion per year. When floods happen, families in these homes often have to rely on personal

34 Bank of Canada, [Climate-Related Flood Risk to Residential Lending Portfolios in Canada](#), 2023, pp. 15–16.

35 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1535 (Kenza El Bied).

36 Ibid.

37 For information on the development of overland flooding insurance coverage in Canada, please see: Michaël Lambert-Racine, Library of Parliament, [HillNote](#), “[The Home Insurance Market and Severe Weather Events in Canada](#),” 16 June 2025.

38 Government of Canada, [Overland flood insurance](#).

39 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1535 (Kenza El Bied).



savings, debt, charities and/or government assistance programs such as the disaster financial assistance arrangements.⁴⁰

A 2016 report by the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, *Estimate of the Average Annual Cost for Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements due to Weather Events*,⁴¹ to which witness Gary Martin (Former Academic, As an individual) drew the committee's attention, explains why flood insurance for high-risk properties is expensive and often involves government backing or regulations in countries where it is offered:

Flood insurance is expensive because of "adverse selection". Only those at greatest risk will want to purchase coverage. This differs from fire insurance where in general, the likelihood of your property burning down is very low and random and virtually everyone purchases fire insurance.

For fire insurance, the overall annual loss can be amortized over a large population and the loss is quite low compared to the total value of insured properties. On the other hand, flood insurance would have much fewer properties and the losses would be quite high compared to the total value of insured properties. This then requires much higher premiums. This is why in countries where flood insurance for high-risk properties is offered, either the insurance is financially backed by the government or regulations require all property insurance holders to purchase flood insurance (cross subsidization).⁴²

In terms of which areas and populations are most at risk of flooding, Statistics Canada commented that "floods were more common in rural areas than urban centres." The department added that neighborhoods affected by flooding were more likely to have greater levels of "economic dependency" and "situational vulnerability."⁴³

40 ENVI, *Evidence*, 10 February 2026, 1535 (Andrew DeFazio).

41 Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, *Estimate of the Average Annual Cost for Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements due to Weather Events*, 25 February 2016.

42 Ibid.

43 Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, "Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government," received 19 March 2026.

According to the department, "economic dependency" included reliance on government transfers (e.g., Old Age Security, employment insurance, social assistance) and with a high ratio of dependents (children and seniors).

"Situational vulnerability" included "homes in greater need of repair with lower market values" and populations with financial vulnerability (e.g., lower levels of education, more single parents).

Beyond Financial Costs: Health and Social Impacts of Extreme Weather Events

In its written response to the committee, Statistics Canada described the impacts of extreme weather events that are captured in its social, health and environment statistics. Regarding extreme heat events, Statistics Canada noted that:

- Exposure to extreme heat is one of the most direct impacts of climate change on health. There has been, and will be, an increase in the frequency and intensity of extreme heat events.
- In 12 large Canadian cities (with population sizes of at least 500,000), daily mortality risk was 2% to 8% higher than average during extreme heat events from 2000 to 2020.
- The impacts of heat were [greater] for older adults (aged 65 and older) than for younger adults.
- Approximately 295 excess deaths in Montréal and 250 excess deaths in Toronto were attributable to extreme heat events in these cities during this period.⁴⁴

Statistics Canada found that long-term wildfire exposure was associated with an increased risk of lung cancer and brain tumours, stating:

There was a 4.9% higher incidence of lung cancer and a 10% higher incidence of brain tumours for people living within 50 km of a wildfire in the past 10 years compared with the unexposed population (excluding the people living in large Canadian cities).⁴⁵

The committee also heard about the significant mental health impacts and social stress brought on by extreme weather events, and resulting evacuations and displacements. First Nations communities' vulnerability to extreme weather impacts was highlighted to the

44 Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, "Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government," received 19 March 2026; which cited: Statistics Canada, [Research to Insights: Social, Economic, and Health Perspectives on Climate Change](#), 15 April 2024; Korsiak et al., *Lancet Planet Health*, "Long-term exposure to wildfires and cancer incidence in Canada: a population-based observational cohort study," 2022, 6(5):e400-e409.

45 Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons' Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, "Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government," received 19 March 2026.



committee.⁴⁶ The Assembly of First Nations attributed this vulnerability to “remoteness, lack of critical infrastructure, resources, and capacity.”⁴⁷ The Assembly of First Nations described the disproportionate impacts to First Nations communities of extreme weather evacuations:

Climate change is having devastating and compounding effects in First Nations communities. Extreme weather events like wildfires, droughts, floods, extreme heat, and atmospheric rivers are becoming more frequent and dangerous, with First Nations bearing disproportionate vulnerability to the worst impacts of these events. For example, in 2025, over 6,000 wildfires burned over 8.3 million hectares across Canada, threatening the landscapes that majority of First Nations people call home. At the height of this season, over 45,000 First Nations [people] from 73 communities were forcibly evacuated from their homes and communities.⁴⁸

The Federation of Canadian Municipalities called for more support for host municipalities during evacuations, to enable them to provide the services needed by those who have been displaced:

Evacuations are becoming more frequent, larger in scale and longer in duration during extreme weather events. Municipal governments coordinate evacuations, operate emergency shelters, and support displaced residents, often with little notice and limited resources. At the same time, municipalities across Canada are increasingly being asked to act as host communities for evacuees from other regions, placing significant strain on local housing, health services and community infrastructure.

Housing availability is one of the most significant challenges facing municipalities during evacuations. Many communities, particularly in regions already experiencing housing shortages, struggle to secure temporary accommodations for evacuees. Prolonged displacement can exacerbate housing insecurity, disrupt employment and schooling, and place additional pressure on local rental markets.

Municipalities also play a critical role in supporting evacuees’ health and social needs. This includes coordinating access to health care, mental health supports, transportation, food services and culturally appropriate supports for Indigenous and vulnerable populations.⁴⁹

Blair Feltmate (Head, Intact Centre on Climate Adaptation, University of Waterloo) shared evidence of the mental health strain caused by flooding from soon-to-be-

46 E.g., Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026; ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1630 (Trevor Bhupsingh, Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and Programs Branch, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness).

47 Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

48 Ibid.

49 Federation of Canadian Municipalities, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

published research by the Intact Centre. He shared that, for homeowners living in flood-impacted neighbourhoods, researchers observed increases in

- medications to cope with stress;
- use of counselling services; and
- lost time from work.⁵⁰

SHAPING THE SOLUTIONS: GOVERNMENT OF CANADA'S ACTIONS RELATED TO EXTREME WEATHER

“Invest now, save later and keep Canadians safe.”

Insurance Bureau of Canada,
[Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

The need to move from a reactive to a proactive approach to extreme weather events was a theme of the evidence heard by the committee.⁵¹ Kenza El Bied from Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada confirmed that this is the Government of Canada's position:

We can no longer take a reactive or ad hoc approach to disasters. We need to evolve our approach to emergency management to meet the challenges before us. It is clear that change is needed so that Canada can better prepare for, mitigate and recover from natural disasters. We need to take a more proactive and whole-of-society approach.⁵²

Robert Muir (Manager, Stormwater, Environmental Services, Corporation of the City of Markham) welcomed the Government of Canada's publication of technical guidelines to support communities taking proactive measures to address flood risk.⁵³ He provided the example of the National Research Council's 2021 cost-benefit guidelines, *Guidelines on*

50 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1115 (Blair Feltmate, Head, Intact Centre on Climate Adaptation, University of Waterloo).

51 E.g., ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1220 (Rebecca Trowell).

52 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1535 (Kenza El Bied).

53 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1220 (Robert Muir, Manager, Stormwater, Environmental Services, Corporation of the City of Markham).



*undertaking a comprehensive analysis of benefits, costs and uncertainties of storm drainage and flood control infrastructure in a changing climate.*⁵⁴

Mitigation Versus Adaptation Funding

Alain Bourque emphasized the importance of both climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation. He stressed that all countries should be reducing their GHG emissions in line with the *Paris Agreement*, which aims for warming “well below 2°C and, if possible, close to 1.5°C, based on scientific evidence.” He admitted that, although necessary, this will be difficult: “The scientific message is very clear: We must aim for 1.5°C to 2°C and adapt to the rest. Doing both will be an extremely tall order.”⁵⁵

Mathieu Boudreault (Professor, Department of Mathematics, Université du Québec à Montréal, As an individual) advised “[w]e must also not lose sight of greenhouse gas reduction initiatives”⁵⁶ to reduce extreme weather events exacerbated by climate change. He warned: “Our current adaptation problem could persist into the future if we don't reduce the incidence, frequency and severity of natural disasters.”⁵⁷

Mathieu Boudreault concluded that “to ensure that we control the frequency and severity of climate events in the long term, moving away from fossil fuels is something we need to do.”⁵⁸ Kiera Taylor noted that litigation by individuals and governments in some jurisdictions (e.g., Germany and California) and legislation in other jurisdictions (e.g., New York and Vermont) are seeking to recover costs from corporations that have profited from their GHG emissions, in order to pay for extreme weather prevention and response.⁵⁹

The committee heard from community leaders about the difficulties in securing sufficient funding support to protect their communities from extreme weather events and climate change. Blaine Payne (Mayor, Town Council of Parson’s Pond) explained that coastal erosion is threatening his community, along with the highway which provides

54 Robert Muir, et al., National Research Council Publications Archive, [*Guidelines on undertaking a comprehensive analysis of benefits, costs and uncertainties of storm drainage and flood control infrastructure in a changing climate*](#), 2021.

55 ENVI, [*Evidence*](#), 3 February 2026, 1725 (Alain Bourque).

56 ENVI, [*Evidence*](#), 26 February 2026, 1235 (Mathieu Boudreault, Professor, Department of Mathematics, Université du Québec à Montréal, As an individual).

57 Ibid.

58 Ibid.

59 ENVI, [*Evidence*](#), 3 February 2026, 1640 (Kiera Taylor).

roadway access to the Northern Peninsula of Newfoundland. With a tax base from just 321 residents, he explained that “[t]he funding required is too big for the town to fix it itself, and all available funding has too big a requirement for our little town to qualify.”⁶⁰

In its brief to the committee, the Town of Humber Arm South also discussed the impacts of climate change being felt in the community— namely erosion and flooding.⁶¹ Although the town was awarded some funding “to support the development of a coastal protection solution,”⁶² rising construction and material costs, compounded by delays and worsening climate change impacts, mean that that funding is no longer sufficient.⁶³ The town emphasized to the committee:

What was once considered a manageable shoreline protection project has now become a more urgent and complex climate adaptation challenge. Small municipalities like ours do not have the financial capacity to undertake projects of this scale on our own. Federal support is essential if we are to protect our infrastructure, our local economy, and our access to the water.⁶⁴

Blair Feltmate highlighted what he saw as insufficient climate change adaptation funding, particularly in comparison to climate change mitigation funding:

From 2015 to 2024, the federal government invested either directly, or by way of tax subsidies, \$160 billion into mitigating greenhouse gas emissions. Over the same period of time, the federal government invested \$6.7 billion into adaptation.

With respect to the climate file, the ratio of spending in this country on mitigation versus adaptation is 24 to one. Almost everything is going to mitigating greenhouse gas emissions, and virtually nothing is for adaptation. I don't know what the right ratio is, but it should not be the lopsided 24 to one, that's for sure.⁶⁵

Louise Wallace Richmond (Councillor, City of Salmon Arm, British Columbia, Federation of Canadian Municipalities) called on the federal government “to immediately invest \$2 billion in adaptation infrastructure, followed by \$1 billion annually for the next 10 years, to protect communities and to reduce costs.”⁶⁶

60 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1110 (Blaine Payne, Mayor, Town Council of Parson’s Pond).

61 Town of Humber Arm South, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), 7 March 2026.

62 Ibid.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid.

65 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1140 (Blair Feltmate).

66 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1105 (Louise Wallace Richmond).



An Ounce of Prevention: The Financial Benefits of Climate Change Adaptation Investments

Several witnesses asserted that investments in climate change adaptation provide a significant return in avoided future extreme weather costs, saving money in the long run.⁶⁷ Leslie Muñoz (Director, Advocacy, Federation of Canadian Municipalities) pointed to the Canadian Climate Institute report, *Prepare or Repair: How climate-proofing public infrastructure pays off*, which found that an investment of \$4 billion in climate adaptation would generate about \$5 to 10 billion in savings.⁶⁸ Leslie Muñoz concluded, “It's more affordable to invest in preparing than it is to repair after the fact.”⁶⁹

Other witnesses suggested an even higher rate of return for adaption investments. Blair Feltmate estimated that “one dollar invested in adaptation produces, in avoided losses per decade, about three to eight dollars.”⁷⁰ Alian Bourque stated that “[s]everal studies have shown that every dollar invested in proper adaptation mitigates impact and generates between \$13 and \$15 in benefits. In other words, investing in adaptation is a good idea.”⁷¹ Similarly, Paul Kovacs (Founder and Executive Director, Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction) stated:

[W]e find that each dollar spent on adaptation avoids five to 10 dollars of losses in the future, and the amount of money being spent is not sufficient. The losses are unacceptable, and further investment than what is in place right now would be a really wise investment by the government.⁷²

Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund

One way in which the Government of Canada supports adaptation works is through the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund (DMAF). The Government of Canada describes the DMAF, which is delivered through Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada, as follows:

67 E.g., ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1115 (Paul Kovacs, Founder and Executive Director, Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction).

68 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1125 (Leslie Muñoz, Director, Advocacy, Federation of Canadian Municipalities); Canadian Climate Institute, [Prepare or Repair: How climate-proofing public infrastructure pays off](#), February 2026, updated April 2026.

69 Ibid.

70 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1115 (Blair Feltmate).

71 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1645 (Alain Bourque).

72 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1135 (Paul Kovacs).

In 2018, the Government of Canada launched the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund (DMAF), committing \$2 billion over 10 years to invest in structural and natural infrastructure projects to increase the resilience of communities that are impacted by natural disasters triggered by climate change.

As announced in Budget 2021, an additional \$1.375 billion in federal funding over 12 years was provided to renew the DMAF. A minimum of \$138 million of this funding is allocated to Indigenous Recipients.

As outlined in the *Government of Canada Adaptation Action Plan (GOCAAP)*, the federal plan to implement the National Adaptation Strategy's goals, objectives and proposed targets, the Government of Canada will invest up to an additional \$489.1 million over 10 years through the DMAF to help communities increase their resiliency against the effects of climate change.

DMAF's funding envelope is currently fully allocated.⁷³

Duncan Redfearn (Chief Administrative Officer, City of Grand Forks) provided the perspective of a city that had been awarded a DMAF grant of approximately \$50 million following catastrophic flooding. He explained that \$20 million of the grant was from the federal government and \$30 million of the grant was from the provincial government. The city itself provided an additional \$5 million in funding.⁷⁴ In his words:

Shortly after receiving the funding, the city commenced a flood mitigation program that centred around managed retreat, which, oversimplified, included substantial flood modelling, the acquisition of land and improvements, the construction of flood protection infrastructure and the return of land to the river, or flood plain naturalization.

As of 2026, the city has spent \$72 million. With this money, we have constructed 3,000 metres of flood protection infrastructure; purchased 90 properties, 70 of which had improvements, including houses; and returned 10 hectares back to the river. Overall, this money has been used to protect our major industrial partners and businesses, critical infrastructure and at-risk neighbourhoods from future events. Fundamentally, however, it has restored confidence in our community and provided for economic stability. Both the viability and the future of our community have been directly correlated to this program's success.⁷⁵

Mr. Redfearn offered some recommendations for improving the program, based on his city's experience:

73 Government of Canada, [Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund: Overview](#).

74 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1540 (Duncan Redfearn, Chief Administrative Officer, City of Grand Forks).

75 Ibid.



- Continue to make annual funding available and support communities experiencing extreme weather events; and
- Increase the flexibility of DMAF funding (e.g., allow it to be used for acquiring land and making land improvements; allow funding to be front-loaded).⁷⁶

Robert Muir highlighted the shortfall in DMAF funding compared to the need that had been estimated through a case study as part of the National Research Council's *Guidelines on undertaking a comprehensive analysis of benefits, costs and uncertainties of storm drainage and flood control infrastructure in a changing climate*. The case study estimated "the 10-year national infrastructure project spending that could be justified based on damage reduction benefits" at \$28 billion.⁷⁷ He explained that, since DMAF "funds 40% of project design and construction costs," today's \$3.8 billion in DMAF program grants could support "\$9.5 billion in project spending,"⁷⁸ representing a significant shortfall from the case study's \$28 billion estimate.⁷⁹ The City of Markham's brief to the committee (of which Mr. Muir was an author) recommended increasing DMAF funding:

While DMAF grants currently support cost-effective projects across Canada to reduce flood losses, the extent of infrastructure with limited design capacity and the scale of expected damages supports an expanded grant program to fund even more projects. Tripling of the infrastructure investment can be justified economically based on future damage reduction benefits.⁸⁰

Susan Penwarden (Managing Director, Personal Lines, Aviva Canada) called for an increase in adaptation funding, also citing the inadequacy of the size of the DMAF:

We need to close the adaptation funding gap through better capital allocation. The \$2-billion disaster mitigation adaptation fund was massively oversubscribed. For perspective, it's estimated that Toronto alone needs \$26 billion in infrastructure improvements to withstand severe weather. We need to give adaptation the urgency it deserves.⁸¹

76 Ibid.

77 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1220 (Robert Muir).

78 Ibid.

79 Ibid.

80 City of Markham, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), 14 January 2026.

81 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1105 (Susan Penwarden).

Leslie Muñoz of the Federation for Canadian Municipalities observed that the DMAF “has been significantly oversubscribed by municipalities across the country in terms of assistance for disaster mitigation.” She expressed concern that the program may be wound down. The Insurance Bureau of Canada called on the Government of Canada “to invest \$500 million to top up the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund to focus on the communities and trade corridors at highest risk.”⁸²

First Nations Adaptation Funding Gaps

In its brief to the committee, the Assembly of First Nations highlighted the infrastructure gap between First Nations communities and other communities in Canada, including infrastructure needed for climate change adaptation:

In 2023, the [Assembly of First Nations (AFN)] released a report developed in collaboration with industry experts, over 400 First Nations, and Indigenous Services Canada (ISC) titled *Closing the Infrastructure Gap by 2030: A Collaborative and Comprehensive Cost Estimate Identifying the Infrastructure Investment Needs of First Nations in Canada*. This report estimates the national capital and operational investments needed from the Government of Canada to fulfill its mandate to Close the First Nation Infrastructure Gap by 2030. Supported by a significant pool of data from AFN technical studies, First Nations engagement reports, archived information from ISC, and information provided directly by First Nations, the report estimates the full investment required to close the infrastructure gap by 2030 as \$349.2 billion, of which \$30.9 billion is required to support climate change adaptation. Climate change adaptation is integral to the management of First Nation assets and constitutes an important element of strategically closing the infrastructure gap by 2030 while protecting federal investments. First Nation infrastructure is currently exposed to environmental hazards, and this exposure will only increase as the impacts of extreme weather events continue to compound. Flooding, fire, drought, and severe weather collectively present a significant threat to the resilience of First Nations, resulting in an escalating potential for the displacement of citizens and disruption to their lives.⁸³

Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements

One long-standing mechanism through which the federal government provides support for recovery after major extreme weather events is the disaster financial assistance arrangements (DFAA) program. In a written response to the committee, Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada described this program:

82 Insurance Bureau of Canada, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

83 Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.



The Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements (DFAA) [program] provides financial assistance to provincial and territorial governments in support of response and recovery efforts resulting from large-scale natural disasters.

Since 1970, the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements (DFAA) program has paid out more than \$9.7 billion to support provinces and territories in managing large-scale natural disasters. Based on known liabilities as of February 2026, the forecasted payments over the next 5 years totals \$4.3 billion; broken down as follows:

- 2025–26: \$375,464,521
- 2026–27: \$1,285,732,901
- 2027–28: \$719,562,130
- 2028–29: \$836,614,781
- 2029–30: \$1,097,705,417⁸⁴

On 1 April 2025, a modernized DFAA program was launched that incorporates the principle of “building back better” for infrastructure and buildings (e.g., reconstruction with extreme weather resilience measures) so that DFAA funding “lowers future risk instead of recreating it.”⁸⁵ Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada noted that:

With the recent modernization of the DFAA, annual DFAA costs are expected to increase in the medium-term (beyond ... five years), as provinces and territories take up the new expanded funding available for post-disaster strategic mitigation and disaster risk reduction investments. However, in the longer-term, costs could decrease as these investments start to generate avoided losses.⁸⁶

Some witnesses expressed appreciation for the recent changes to the DFAA that require funding recipients to “build back better.”⁸⁷ Paul Kovacs described the changes as

84 Public Safety Canada, Written Response to Questions submitted to ENVI, 10 February 2026. Public Safety Canada notes that the Disaster Financial Assistance Agreements’ forecasting is “evergreen” “in recognition of the fluidity of the program (e.g., continual intake; forecast based on estimates; timing and amount of forecasted payment requests based on their needs and capacity, etc.) and the rise, unpredictability, and severity of natural disasters.”

85 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1540 (Kenza El Bied).

86 Public Safety Canada, Written Response to Questions submitted to ENVI, 10 February 2026.

87 E.g., Federation of Canadian Municipalities, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026; ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1210 (Mathieu Boudreault).

"outstanding"⁸⁸ and a "very positive move by the Government of Canada."⁸⁹ Sophie Guilbault (Director of Partnerships, Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction) added:

The DFAA is very proactive in the sense that it says fairly clearly that we will not pay again if they choose to re- build in a high-risk area without the appropriate mitigation measures. This is a very strong step in the right direction, in that it supports the understanding of risk and the risk mapping and mitigation planning.⁹⁰

Although Spencer Coyne (Mayor, Town of Princeton) applauded "the changes to the DFAA to build back better," he lamented the lack of "a dedicated funding model to help rebuild" communities after a catastrophic event.⁹¹

Support for First Nations Following Extreme Weather

The committee heard about the challenges faced by First Nations because their lands fall under federal jurisdiction, yet federal funding through the DFAA flows only through provinces and territories.⁹² According to Public Safety Canada, the

Emergency Management Assistance Program (EMAP) at Indigenous Services Canada offers on-reserve First Nations communities disaster response and recovery supports similar to that of Public Safety's Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements (DFAA) as well as preparedness and mitigation supports. Through EMAP, uninsured damages to community infrastructure and primary residences caused by natural events such as flooding are covered 100%.⁹³

In its brief, the Assembly of First Nations called for greater investment to the EMAP, to enable all 634 First Nations to have a paid full-time emergency management coordinator position.⁹⁴

88 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1130 (Paul Kovacs).

89 Ibid., 1145.

90 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1125 (Sophie Guilbault).

91 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1540 (Spencer Coyne, Mayor, Town of Princeton).

92 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1710 (Zachary Vrhovsek, Analyst, Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer).

93 Public Safety Canada, Written Response to Questions submitted to ENVI, 10 February 2026. See: Indigenous Services Canada, [Emergency Management Assistance Program](#).

94 Assembly of First Nations, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.



Potential Public Reinsurance in Lieu of the Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements

Mathieu Boudreault suggested possibly converting the DFAA program into a self-funded provincial reinsurance program.⁹⁵ Statistics Canada provided the following definition of reinsurance:

Reinsurance is effectively insurance for insurance companies who reinsure a portion of their portfolios to transfer risk to another party. Insurers are heavily reliant on the ability to transfer risk, especially for smaller insurers, and more so as extreme weather increases. Reinsurance allows insurers to avoid absorbing 100% of the risks and, in some cases, avoid insolvency.⁹⁶

Mr. Boudreault elaborated on his views of the benefits of public reinsurance:

Converting the DFAA into a self-funded provincial reinsurance program, where premiums are proportional to risk, could help control its use and encourage risk management practices that are sound and sustainable in the long term.

I also propose creating a Crown corporation whose mandate would be to administer this reinsurance program, as well as reassure the industry, provinces and municipalities. A public reinsurance corporation would strengthen the Canadian insurance industry's capacity to manage the risk of disasters such as earthquakes and forest fires and make it less dependent on the international market, which is currently tightening its access conditions for Canada.⁹⁷

Andrew DeFazio agreed that reinsurance could be an “important element” and a way to increase stability in insurance markets.⁹⁸

Canada’s National Adaptation Strategy

The committee heard some discussion about *Canada’s National Adaptation Strategy*, released in 2023, which is “intended to guide action in Canada to better adapt to and prepare for the impacts of climate change.”⁹⁹ The National Adaptation Strategy lays out

95 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1210 (Mathieu Boudreault).

96 Statistics Canada, Written Response to Questions, *Information Presented to the House of Commons’ Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development*, “Impacts of extreme weather and climate events on households, businesses, and government,” received 19 March 2026.

97 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1210 (Mathieu Boudreault).

98 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 10 February 2026, 1620 (Andrew DeFazio).

99 Government of Canada, [Canada’s National Adaptation Strategy](#), 2023.

goals, objectives and 26 targets across the five interconnected systems, as illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2—The five interconnected systems described in Canada’s National Adaptation Strategy



Source: Government of Canada, *Canada's National Adaptation Strategy*, 2023.

Blair Feltmate expressed concern that Canada will not meet the targets laid out in the National Adaptation Strategy on time:



In 2023, we had the [N]ational [A]daptation [S]trategy. It put out 26 targets to mobilize action on adaptation, 10 of which are to be realized before 2026 closes. We're going to miss virtually all of those.

The problem is that we have known solutions to known problems, but we cannot get the federal government to act, to mobilize in that direction. That's the problem.¹⁰⁰

Blair Feltmate went on to elaborate on one of those targets, “that by 2025, 50% of Canadians would have taken concrete actions to better prepare for and respond to climate change risks facing their households.” In his opinion, Canadians need more information on the actions they could take to increase resilience. Examples of such actions provided by witnesses include applying the principles of FireSmart Canada¹⁰¹ and flood protection mechanisms such as installing and testing a sump pump, installing a backwater valve, and ensuring landscaping slopes so that water flows away from a building’s foundation.¹⁰² Blair Feltmate noted that there were existing successful public awareness campaigns, like insurance companies or mortgage providers producing infographics to promote adaptation measures, which the federal government could further promote by hosting them on departmental websites.¹⁰³

National Flood Insurance Program

Many witnesses expressed their support for a national high-risk flood insurance program, in partnership between the federal government and insurers, in order to offer affordable flood insurance to those living in high flood risk areas, while still encouraging mitigation measures.¹⁰⁴ The Co-operators noted that the federal government had committed to implementing a national high-risk flood insurance program through Budget 2023 and stated:

Co-operators has long advocated for the [National high-risk Flood Insurance Program (NFIP)] to adopt a whole-of-society approach in its implementation, and we remain committed to working with the government to stand up the NFIP. If designed properly, the government’s NFIP could help create price signals, motivate consumers, and materially catalyze risk reduction investments. Community resilience and risk mitigation

100 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1150 (Blair Feltmate).

101 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1540 (Spencer Coyne); FireSmart Canada, [FireSmart Canada](#).

102 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1110 (Sophie Guilbault).

103 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1120 (Blair Feltmate).

104 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1105 (Susan Penwarden); ENVI, [Evidence](#), February 3, 2026, 1535 (Janice Myers); ENVI, [Evidence](#), 8 December 2025, 1110 (Paul Kovacs); Co-operators Group, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), March 2026; Wawanese Mutual Insurance Company, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), 18 February 2026; Federation of Canadian Municipalities, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

must be embedded in the NFIP framework. Otherwise, the timeline could be infinite, and the program will not be sustainable.¹⁰⁵

Spencer Coyne recommended that Canada pursue an “all-hazards guaranteed insurance program” that is not limited to just floods, but rather covers those who live in areas at high risk for other events like wildfires.¹⁰⁶

On 22 April 2026, Federal Emergency Management Minister Eleanor Olszewski confirmed that the Government of Canada is looking into a national flood insurance program but did not commit to a timeline for rolling out the program.¹⁰⁷

Ensuring Resiliency in Future Development

The committee heard some discussion about incorporating climate resilience into the Build Canada Homes program. Alain Bourque advised that, for large investments and programs like Build Canada Homes, “we must ensure that criteria are imposed to guarantee the longevity of investments and effective management of the risk of extreme weather events.”¹⁰⁸

He noted that municipalities in Quebec are developing climate plans that include climate change mitigation and adaptation, and that the development of these plans was enabled by \$500 million in funding from the Quebec government.¹⁰⁹ “That \$500 million comes from the carbon market with California, which generates revenue for Quebec that can be reinvested in this type of initiative.”¹¹⁰

Mathieu Boudreault recommended that the Government of Canada explore supporting certification for resilient buildings to incentivize investments in adaptation measures:

The federal government should also support any initiatives to certify the resilience level of buildings. The certificates would send a major signal to the market for maintaining insurability and securing mortgage credit.¹¹¹

105 Co-operators Group, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), March 2026.

106 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1540 (Spencer Coyne).

107 Nick Murray, The Canadian Press, CBC, [Minister won't commit to national flood insurance program in near future](#), 22 April 2026.

108 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 3 February 2026, 1710 (Alain Bourque).

109 Ibid.

110 Ibid.

111 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1215 (Mathieu Boudreault).



Susan Penwarden suggested that the following measures could help achieve a transition to proactive investment in risk reduction and resilience of buildings:

- Updating the national model codes¹¹² to include climate resilience;
- Ensuring adaptation is at the core of the Build Canada Homes agency framework; and
- Working with all levels of government to ensure that critical infrastructure is upgraded to meet future weather conditions.¹¹³

Flood Mapping

The committee heard that Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada was “developing the flood finder portal, where Canadians will see whether their homes are located in a high-risk area and what tools would be available for them to address that.”¹¹⁴ Kenza El Bied noted that the department would work with provinces and territories, which in some jurisdictions have their own flood mapping, to make sure the flood finder portal contains complementary information.¹¹⁵

Several witnesses expressed support for high-quality flood mapping to help Canadians understand risk in their area. For example, the Federal of Canadian Municipalities stated:

The federal government has an important role in raising awareness about climate risks, including by working with provinces and territories on high-quality flood mapping and

112 The national model codes are described in ENVI’s 2018 report, *Better Buildings for a Low-Carbon Future* (pp. 13–14) as follows:

To leverage federal building research capacity, and to promote national consistency, the federal government participates in the development of construction standards in the form of national model building codes. These codes are developed through close consultation with provinces, territories, and industry by the Canadian Commission on Building and Fire Codes, with support from the National Research Council of Canada. [...] Given that the provinces have jurisdiction over construction, these national model codes serve as recommendations only. The requirements they contain are not legally binding unless they are set out in provincial laws and regulations. The provinces and territories and, in certain cases, municipalities, may incorporate the requirements of the national model codes in whole or in part, and with or without amendments. The provinces and territories also have the option of adopting new requirements to meet specific needs.

113 ENVI, *Evidence*, 8 December 2025, 1105 (Susan Penwarden).

114 ENVI, *Evidence*, 10 February 2026, 1550 (Kenza El Bied).

115 Ibid.

moving forward with a high-risk flood portal to help homeowners, businesses and communities understand their risks.¹¹⁶

On 4 May 2026, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development tabled a report to Parliament, *Flood Hazard Mapping*, which reported on his performance audit of the extent to which Environment and Climate Change Canada, Natural Resources Canada, and Public Safety Canada “ensured the timely production of flood hazard maps that are effective for supporting climate change adaptation and protecting people living in Canada.”¹¹⁷ Among the audit’s findings were that:

- Public Safety Canada missed its deadline to release Canada-wide flood risk ratings through a flood risk awareness portal by the end of 2025; and
- As of 31 December 2025, out of 131 mapping projects underway:
 - only 64 (49%) included priority areas of higher risk as prioritized in Natural Resources Canada’s 2022 analysis exercise; and
 - only 11 (8%) had been posted on the Canada Flood Map Inventory.¹¹⁸

The Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development made recommendations including the following:

- To ensure the ongoing reliability of flood hazard maps and federal guidelines to support climate change adaptation, Natural Resources Canada and Environment and Climate Change Canada should regularly review and update their approach to verify that all maps follow appropriate technical requirements, including up-to-date scientific information related to climate change impacts; and
- To protect individuals most vulnerable to flooding and to help mitigate the increasing cost of flood relief in the context of climate change, Natural Resources Canada should work collaboratively with provinces

116 Federation of Canadian Municipalities, [Brief submitted to ENVI](#), February 2026.

117 Office of the Auditor General of Canada, Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development Reports, [Flood Hazard Mapping](#), 4 May 2026.

118 Ibid.



and territories to update its list of higher-risk areas and monitor coverage of those areas to inform funding decisions.¹¹⁹

Nature-Based Solutions

The committee heard evidence about the importance of nature-based solutions to climate change adaptation, including working with natural boundaries (e.g., watersheds/ water basins) to manage flood risk. Rebecca Trowell (North Basin Manager, Red River Basin Commission) spoke of the cross-border cooperation required to manage the whole of the Red River water basin, which spans Manitoba and North Dakota. To enable this cooperation, the Red River Basin Commission is comprised of “local, state, provincial and [F]irst [N]ations government representation; the environmental community” and the general public. Ms. Trowell described the importance of management at the water basin level, as well natural infrastructure, such as wetlands:

Protecting residents from both drought and flood requires longterm, basin-wide thinking. One of the most effective tools available is investment in natural infrastructure that decreases the risk of both flood and drought.¹²⁰

Gary Martin shared lessons from his work studying flood risk and the politics of housing development in Canada and the Netherlands. He discussed the Dutch Water Authorities, “an 800-year-old institution with elected boards that coordinate flood resilience, watershed by watershed,” that has succeeded for 70 years in preventing any “serious urban flood on a major river or from the sea.”¹²¹ Gary Martin drew a comparison between the Dutch Water Authorities and Ontario’s 36 conservation authorities, which are also organized by watershed and “have a similar mandate, which includes restricting development in flood zones.” He cited a 2016 report of the Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer, *Estimate of the Average Annual Cost for Disaster Financial Assistance Arrangements due to Weather Events*, which reported on DFAA payouts by province and territory. The report showed that DFAA payouts for flood recovery in the province of Ontario were “by far the lowest per capita” of all Canadian provinces and territories, which was attributed to Ontario’s conservation authorities having “kept development out of flood zones.”¹²² Gary Martin commented on the importance and effectiveness of

119 Ibid.

120 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1220 (Rebecca Trowell, North Basin Manager, Red River Basin Commission).

121 ENVI, [Evidence](#), 26 February 2026, 1215 (Gary Martin, Former Academic, As an individual).

122 Ibid.

watershed-based management, such as that in Ontario through Conservation Authorities:

Given regulatory authority and a mandate to protect homes and neighbourhoods, a mandate that's hard to politicize, watershed management organizations can prevent development in flood zones. Canada does not have coordinated watershed management. Allow me to suggest that the federal government consider this as one of its strategies for reducing flood risk.¹²³

The committee observes that managing flood risk at the watershed level can significantly reduce flood risk and damages, as evidenced both in Canada and in the Netherlands.

CONCLUSION

The evidence heard by the committee was clear: the increasing frequency and severity of extreme weather is not just a future projection but a present reality for Canadian communities. Canada is experiencing record-breaking extreme weather, where the frequency, intensity, and duration of events like wildfires, floods, and atmospheric rivers are placing pressure on infrastructure, housing, and the financial stability of residents. By pairing public policy tools with insurer risk expertise and local leadership, Canada can reduce future losses, protect the homes of Canadians, and lay a foundation for national resilience. The committee offers the following recommendations, in the spirit of helping the Government of Canada to proactively prevent damage and hardship from extreme weather events:

Recommendation 1

That the Government of Canada reaffirm its commitment to the *Paris Agreement* and thus to meeting its greenhouse gas emission reduction targets, and acknowledge that failing to meet these targets would be a factor of increase in extreme weather events.

Recommendation 2

That the Government of Canada encourage and work with the financial sector to adapt to climate change and that the Government of Canada ensure its contribution to the adaptation efforts of organizations and individuals.

123 *Ibid.*



Recommendation 3

That the Government of Canada make immediate and strategic reinvestments in the Disaster Mitigation and Adaptation Fund and work with provinces and territories to address local climate change adaptation needs.

Recommendation 4

That the Government of Canada provide financial, technical, and human resources to First Nations to support the development, implementation, and monitoring of emergency management strategies, action plans, and risk assessments.

Recommendation 5

That the Government of Canada strengthen First Nations' financial, technical, and human capacity to conduct climate change assessments and monitoring at the community level.

Recommendation 6

That the Government of Canada continue to use green bonds to support the growth of the sustainable finance market in Canada and help support investments in climate adaptation.

Recommendation 7

That the Government of Canada work in concert with provincial and territorial governments, while respecting their respective jurisdictions, to ensure that its own climate change adaptation actions are consistent with those already being taken in the various provinces and territories.

Recommendation 8

That the Government of Canada establish an insurance program that would allow everyone to obtain affordable insurance against recurring natural disasters.

Recommendation 9

That the Government of Canada work with other jurisdictions and the private sector to support and amplify existing public awareness campaigns that promote the implementation of adaptation measures at the household level.

Recommendation 10

That the Government of Canada continue to develop and regularly assess its National Adaptation Strategy.

Recommendation 11

That the Government of Canada improve its process for identifying issues, objectives, and targets, and continuously monitor progress on climate change adaptation.

Recommendation 12

That the Government of Canada integrate climate resilience into public infrastructure funding by ensuring that all public infrastructure funding systematically takes climate risks into account and helps infrastructure owners reduce their long-term vulnerability.

Recommendation 13

That the Government of Canada adopt a comprehensive approach to integrating climate change adaptation into infrastructure management, specifically in the planning, operation, maintenance, and renewal of public infrastructure, to ensure that it continues to function safely and reliably under future climate conditions.

Recommendation 14

That the Government of Canada follow through on its commitment to support home renovations that promote sustainability and resilience and ensure that best practices for adaptation are incorporated into the design, construction, upgrading, and management of buildings and infrastructure, including natural infrastructure.

Recommendation 15

That the Government of Canada support any initiative to certify the resilience of buildings; such certifications would send a strong signal to the market, helping to maintain insurability and access to mortgage financing.

Recommendation 16

That the Government of Canada elevate the urgency of emergency management to reflect the increased frequency and severity of extreme weather events.



Recommendation 17

That the Government of Canada adopt a “whole-of-society” approach to emergency management, recalibrating the integration of systems to enable greater coordination, collaboration, and efficiency.

Recommendation 18

That the Government of Canada launch a national flood insurance program informed by flood mapping which accurately reflects risk in flood-vulnerable areas.

Recommendation 19

That the Government of Canada continue to prioritize funding climate adaptation, addressing aging infrastructure, and incentivizing building back better in the interest of long-term economic efficiency and improved outcomes following natural disasters.

Recommendation 20

That the Government of Canada create a national emergency management agency to strengthen emergency management in Canada, coordinate emergency management entities, address capacity gaps, and increase efficiency in deployment and resource management.

Recommendation 21

That the Government of Canada promote the building of resilient, climate-ready homes and infrastructure, and encourage retrofitting and upgrades for older homes and infrastructure.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF WITNESSES

The following table lists the witnesses who appeared before the committee at its meetings related to this report. Transcripts of all public meetings related to this report are available on the committee’s [webpage for this study](#).

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
As an individual Craig Stewart, Author	2025/12/08	20
Aviva Canada Susan Penwarden, Managing Director, Personal Lines	2025/12/08	20
Corporation of the City of Markham Robert Muir, Manager, Stormwater, Environmental Services	2025/12/08	20
Institute for Catastrophic Loss Reduction Paul Kovacs, Founder and Executive Director Sophie Guilbault, Director of Partnerships	2025/12/08	20
Intact Centre on Climate Adaptation, University of Waterloo Blair Feltmate, Head, Intact Centre on Climate Adaptation	2025/12/08	20
Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company David Leibl, Vice President, Sustainability & Corporate Affairs Mitchell McEwen, Director, Sustainability & Climate Resilience	2025/12/08	20
Canadian Real Estate Association Janice Myers, Chief executive officer	2026/02/03	23
City of Grand Forks Duncan Redfearn, Chief Administrative Officer	2026/02/03	23
Investors for Paris Compliance Kiera Taylor, Senior Policy Analyst	2026/02/03	23

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Ouranos Alain Bourque, Executive Director	2026/02/03	23
Town of Princeton Spencer Coyne, Mayor	2026/02/03	23
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation Andrew DeFazio, Director, Risk Management, Strategy and Products	2026/02/10	24
Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Trevor Bhupsingh, Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and Programs Branch Kenza El Bied, Director General, Emergency Management Policy and Outreach	2026/02/10	24
Office of the Parliamentary Budget Officer Jason Jacques, Interim Parliamentary Budget Officer Zachary Vrhovsek, Analyst	2026/02/10	24
Statistics Canada Jennifer Withington, Assistant Chief Statistician, Economic Statistics Ryan MacDonald, Director, Economic and Social Analysis and Modelling Division Matthew Hoffarth, Assistant Director, National Economic Accounts Division	2026/02/10	24
As an individual Mathieu Boudreault, Professor, Department of Mathematics, Université du Québec à Montréal Dr. Gary Martin, Former Academic	2026/02/26	27
Federation of Canadian Municipalities Louise Wallace Richmond, Councillor, City of Salmon Arm, British Columbia Leslie Muñoz, Director, Advocacy	2026/02/26	27
Red River Basin Commission Rebecca Trowell, North Basin Manager	2026/02/26	27

Organizations and Individuals	Date	Meeting
Town Council of Parson's Pond Blaine Payne, Mayor Josephine Goosney, Councillor	2026/02/26	27

APPENDIX B: LIST OF BRIEFS

The following is an alphabetical list of organizations and individuals who submitted briefs to the committee related to this report. For more information, please consult the committee's [webpage for this study](#).

Assembly of First Nations

City of Markham

Co-operators Group

Federation of Canadian Municipalities

General Insurance OmbudService

Insurance Brokers Association of Canada

Insurance Bureau of Canada

Intact Centre on Climate Adaptation

Town of Humber Arm South

Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company

REQUEST FOR GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee requests that the government table a comprehensive response to this report.

A copy of the relevant *Minutes of Proceedings* ([Meetings Nos. 20, 23, 24, 27, 32 and 41](#)) is tabled.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon Miedema
Chair

Dissenting Opinion from the Conservative Members of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Conservative members agree with the central concern that brought this study before the committee. Canadian families and taxpayers are facing costs from floods, fires, droughts, storms, heat, and other severe weather events. Those costs show up in damaged homes, washed out roads, flooded basements, and evacuated communities.

Flooding is Canada's most expensive severe weather risk. It is increasing federal disaster payments and leaving many families without proper protection. The people most exposed to flooding are often the least able to afford the damage. The committee heard that flood risk is especially serious in rural areas, where communities may have older infrastructure, fewer resources, and households with less financial room to recover after a disaster.

Conservatives support serious work on adaptation, flood mapping, flood forecasting, watershed management, natural infrastructure, and disaster mitigation. Where the majority report reflects those priorities, we agree and are prepared to work constructively. However, we cannot support a report that does not account for the government's record. Families need flood maps that are finished and usable, flood warnings that work, disaster programs that are timely and accessible, and infrastructure funding that reaches communities before the next flood, fire, drought, or storm hits.

The problem is not that the government has lacked announcements, targets, portals, or frameworks. The problem is that too often it has failed to deliver the basic tools Canadians need before the water rises. A family living in a flood prone area does not need another speech when they are trying to find out whether their municipality has reliable flood maps, whether a culvert has been upgraded, whether a dike will hold, and whether a warning will arrive in time.

The most serious evidence arrived after the committee's hearings. The Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development reported that the federal government had been too slow in producing flood hazard maps that are effective for adaptation and public protection. Public Safety Canada missed its deadline to release Canada wide flood risk ratings through a flood risk awareness portal by the end of 2025. As of December 31, 2025, out of 131 mapping projects underway, only 64 included priority higher risk areas identified through Natural Resources Canada's 2022 analysis, and only 11 had been posted on the Canada Flood Map Inventory. The Commissioner also found that departments needed to ensure maps followed proper technical requirements, including up to date scientific information related to climate impacts, and that Natural Resources Canada should work with provinces and territories to update its list of higher risk areas and monitor coverage to inform funding decisions.

The government knows flood risk affects household costs, mortgage risk, municipal planning, emergency management, and federal disaster liabilities. Yet the tools needed by homeowners, municipalities, insurers, builders, farmers, and emergency planners were delayed, incomplete, or not posted in a usable way.

The same problem appeared during the committee's study of Bill C-241, the *National Strategy on Flood and Drought Forecasting Act*. The government moved an amendment that weakened the bill.

It changed the core language from a requirement to prepare a proposal for a cooperative national hydrological and water resources forecasting service and system into weaker language about measures the government “may” take, including the preparation of a proposal. That is not a small drafting change. In legislation, “must” and “may” do very different things. One creates an obligation, while the other creates an option. The government took a bill that was meant to require a plan and turned it into permission to consider one.

That amendment weakened the obligation at the same time this report emphasizes the urgency of floods, droughts, and severe weather. A government that says these risks are serious should not weaken legislation designed to improve forecasting.

The same concern applies to weather forecasting. At the same time the government says Canadians are facing more severe storms, Environment and Climate Change Canada have disbanded the radar research team behind the country’s upgraded weather radar network. Weather radar is one of the tools used to track storms, measure rainfall, detect hail, estimate wind, support warnings, and give emergency officials more time to act.

For years, the government has warned that severe weather is becoming more dangerous, more costly, and more frequent. Canadians therefore have a right to expect better forecasting, not cuts to the scientific expertise that helps make warnings more accurate. The government has spent heavily on modern radar equipment, but radar equipment alone is not enough. We also need the researchers and technical experts who know how to interpret, improve, and apply that data. Radar research helps turn raw information into warnings people can use.

The radar research cuts reinforce the same concern. The government should not be weakening flood and drought forecasting legislation while also reducing research capacity tied to severe weather detection and warnings. Canadians are being told to prepare for more dangerous weather. The federal government should not remove expertise from the systems that help them prepare.

This is the problem we keep seeing. The government announces programs, misses deadlines, asks Canadians to wait, and then fails to provide clear timelines, public reporting, or accountability for what went wrong. The more serious the risk, the more Parliament should insist on timelines, cost controls, and clear consequences for failure.

The draft report also includes a recommendation asking the Government of Canada to reaffirm its commitment to the Paris Agreement and state that missing its emissions targets would contribute to more extreme weather.

The Liberals are asking Parliament to reaffirm targets that many of their own MPs say the government is no longer serious about meeting. A group of Liberal MPs has warned the Prime Minister about environmental backsliding. Steven Guilbeault, the former Environment Minister and one of the loudest voices in the Liberal climate agenda, is now publicly criticizing the government’s direction. Conservatives do not raise that because we agree with Mr. Guilbeault. We do not. We raise it because the government is asking this committee to reaffirm commitments at the same time members of its own caucus know they are not serious about them.

When Liberal MPs write reports, they reach for sweeping language about climate change. That may help them paper over internal fights, but we find it rather disingenuous. Liberal members of this

committee ask us to believe they remain deeply committed to the climate positions they once championed, but they sure have a funny way of showing it. Their scrutiny of their own government has not so much weakened as gone into witness protection. The urgency they demand from everyone else seems to vanish the moment their own Minister takes the chair. Officials are spared the hard questions. These MPs used to speak as if their environmental principles came first. Now, when those principles require them to challenge their own government, they suddenly go quiet. They are loud when the target is someone else, but careful, cautious, and silent when accountability would mean pressing their own Minister for answers. Canadians can see the difference between MPs who are willing to stand by what they believe and MPs who only find their voice when it costs them nothing.

Conservatives also do not support recommendations that simply call for more spending without saying what problem the money will solve or how success will be measured. The committee heard that it is often cheaper to prevent damage than to clean it up afterward, and we agree. But every dollar should be tied to a clear result. Will it lower flood risk? Will it protect homes, roads, bridges, water systems, or other essential infrastructure? Will it stop the same communities from being hit again and again by disasters that could have been reduced or prevented? That is where funding should go first.

The current approach too often works best for large cities with staff, consultants, and the budget to complete complex applications. Smaller municipalities should not be punished because they cannot afford expensive engineering work before they even know whether they qualify for help. Rural and smaller communities face serious risks too, and federal programs should be simple enough for them to use. Disaster prevention should not become another system where the communities most in need are the least able to get through the front door.

Canadians deserve a government focused on results. They deserve maps that work, warnings that arrive, infrastructure that holds, radar systems backed by the expertise needed to use them properly, and federal programs that reduce future losses instead of simply paying the bills after disaster strikes.

Supplementary Report by the Bloc Québécois to the Seventh Report of the Standing Committee on the Environment and Sustainable Development on Protecting Canadian Residents from Extreme Weather Events

At the Bloc Québécois, we believe that prevention is the most responsible approach to ensuring public safety in the face of the climate crisis.

In the 2025 elections, we made adaptation a central part of our political priorities, and in collaboration with the Institut de recherche en économie contemporaine (IREC), the Bloc Québécois commissioned a study in March 2025 on the costs of climate change. The study concluded that concrete examples demonstrate that the costs of climate change for Quebec (and Canadian) households are no longer theoretical or distant, but are already manifesting in daily life, from grocery bills to insurance premiums, from roof repairs to municipal levees.

In our election platform, we proposed several measures that fully recognize the scale of the current and future impacts of climate change on health, the environment, and public finances.

Including the proposal for a reinsurance program, allowing everyone to access affordable insurance against recurring natural disasters. Unfortunately, the current government has not adopted these proposals.

This supplementary report therefore reiterates the need for proactive action to reduce the risks and costs associated with extreme weather events exacerbated by climate change. We believe it is imperative to invest heavily in both climate change adaptation and the greenhouse gas reduction in order to limit future needs.

We are pleased that several of the Bloc Québécois' recommendations were included by the committee in the main report. However, we would like to add the following recommendations to complete it.

Recommendation No. 1: Immediate Transfers to the Provinces

Proactive funding for adaptation should help strengthen the resilience of public infrastructure against the impacts of climate change and mitigate losses and damages in a way that reduces long-term costs.

The federal government must assume its financial share of the infrastructure deficit without encroaching on the jurisdictions of other governments. Since the federal government does not own the majority of at-risk infrastructure, its leverage is primarily financial. Municipalities own more than 60% of at-risk public infrastructure in Canada, and Quebec municipalities could face an additional \$2 billion in annual infrastructure spending by 2055 due to climate risks¹. For this reason, the Bloc Québécois insists that federal funds dedicated to climate change adaptation be transferred directly to Quebec and the provinces to enhance their climate adaptation plans.

Recommendation No. 2: Modernization of economic models

The Guardian published an article on February 5, 2025, titled: “Flawed economic models could lead to a global economic collapse due to the climate crisis, experts warn”². This conclusion stems from a report based on the expert opinions of 68 climate scientists working at research institutes and public agencies in the United Kingdom, the United States, China, and nine other countries. Their report concludes governments, regulators and financial managers must pay far more attention to high impact but lower likelihood risks, because avoiding irreversible outcomes by cutting carbon emissions is far cheaper than trying to cope with them. They said that rather than waiting for perfect models of risk, greater emphasis should be placed on extremes, not just central estimates, and on the vulnerability of the entire financial system. That is why the Bloc Québécois is making the following recommendation.

That the Ministry of Finance and the Parliamentary Budget Officer incorporate the potential impacts of the climate crisis into their economic projections, based on various temperature rise scenarios, including exceptional increases in extreme weather events and tipping points.

That the various temperature rise scenarios be based, among other things, on the UN Environment Programme’s (UNEP) global warming projections, notably the Gap Report on Emissions Reduction Needs and Prospects, which notes that global warming projections for this century, based on the full implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), are now 2.3 to 2.5 °C, while those based on current policies are 2.8 °C, noting that Canada is warming at roughly twice the global average.

¹ [Étude sur les impacts des changements climatiques sur les finances municipales du Québec, https://www.ouranos.ca/sites/default/files/2023-05/proj-202025-impacts-cc-finances-municipales-709070-gosselin-rapportfinal.pdf](https://www.ouranos.ca/sites/default/files/2023-05/proj-202025-impacts-cc-finances-municipales-709070-gosselin-rapportfinal.pdf), July 22nd 2022

² [Flawed economic models mean climate crisis could crash global economy, experts warn | Green economy | The Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2026/feb/05/flawed-economic-models-mean-climate-crisis-could-crash-global-economy-experts-warn](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2026/feb/05/flawed-economic-models-mean-climate-crisis-could-crash-global-economy-experts-warn), February 5th 2026

That the results of these various models, particularly the impact on real GDP, be made public and inform government decisions.

