

Q1: Should all access by members of the public to rural property require the express advance permission of the rural land owner regardless of the activity?	Q2: Should there be a distinction between cultivated land, fenced property and open pasture land or should all land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same?	Q3: How should permission be sought and granted?	Q4: Would making consent an express prerequisite in all circumstances represent an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities?
Absolutely	All should be treated the same.	Individuals should seek permission directly from land owners as Municipal Office are overtaxed with work as is.	No, privately owned land is exactly that, private.
Not every circumstance can be covered with one blanket legislation. A member of the public may simply be putting back stray livestock.	all land the same		Recreational activists are the ones who should require permission.
Yes	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	By attending site and yes the land owner or occupier should give permission to give out his information to people seeking permission.	No, everyone should get permission before entering onto anyone's land.
Yes	Distinction	Rm's could have permission in writing from landowners to give out addresses or emails or cell numbers so that access can be requested. I don't think people would want strangers coming to their door nowadays.	Those people should have consent anyways
Access by the public to rural property should require prior written permission of the rural land owner or occupier. No written permission than that would be an offence.	All land should be treated the same	They should seek permission from the most direct route of the main access.	I think they would all need written permission to access private land. The recreational users - hunters, atv users, snowmobile users are the main groups that trespass. Leaving garbage on the private property, cutting fences, leaving gates open, etc.
Yes	No	Verbal between owner or tenant	No
Yes absolutely	It should be all treated the same and should all require permission. We have had livestock shot in the past and our crops have been damaged due to trespassers.	I feel written permission should be obtained whether via, e-mail, texts etc. There should always be a paper trail so there is proof that permission was granted. If it is rented land permission should come from land owners and renter.	no
YES	ALL LAND FOR AGRICULTURE TREATED THE SAME!!	AN INTER ACTIVE SOFTWARE MAP WHERE LANDOWNERS WOULD POST THE LAND WITH CONTACT INFORMATION - OR STIPULATE NO ACCESS GRANTED AT ALL!	NO - NOT AT ALL - THERE ARE TRAILS PERMITTING SUCH ACTIVITIES, THIS IS LONG OVERDUE!
YES	All land should be treated the same	Direct route from a main access point	No it wouldn't
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	Permission should be sought the best way possible (attending inhabited residence/telephone/access via RM map or attend RM office/e-mail if known/text.	No it would not.
Yes	Treated the same	Leaving the numbers or email address at the Municipal Office if owner wishes to.	No, they should not be on the land without permission. There are recreational sites for those activities.
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	Written contract	No
Yes	All land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.		No
Yes	All the same		
Yes. Access without the approval of the owner or occupier without consent for any reason should constitute an offence.	All treated the same	Phone ahead of time and arrange to get written permission	No
yes	Distinction between them		
Yes	All land for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	Individuals should attend at any on site inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point.	Consent should always be required to enter onto private land.
express permission should be required	all land used for agriculture purposes be treated the same	inhabited residence by most direct route from main access point	no

The main concern in my opinion is the occupied yard site, bin yard, barn yard or other obviously utilized area of land. People should be required to enter the property by the obvious access route and report their arrival to the landowner. If no one is on site they should respect the private property and leave immediately.	Permission should be required other than accessing property to request permission to enter the property whatever the use.	Access should be sought using the obvious access route to the home or workshop or barn if it is obviously occupied otherwise they should leave the property immediately.	No there are snowmobile routes for snowmobiles and ATVs should be licensed so they can access road ditches legally and low volume rural roads that would be specified as ATV routes do people can play with their toys. It would require proper lighting of ATVs to meet the Highway Act or whatever it's called.
YES	ALL LANDS		
		Written permission should be required for access to private farmland for hunters and recreation enthusiasts. My farm is not Jo public's playground	No
Yes they should require permission prior to accessing rural land.	They all should be treated the same	Permission could be granted through phone conversation	No it would not.
Yes	All the same	Written permission .	No
Yes	All land for Ag purposes should be the same	Individuals should have to make the most direct route from a main access point. All permissions should be in writing, not verbal. Email consent would also be valid, however I would argue who would you get those email address as the RM wouldn't be allowed to release e-mail addresses due to FOIP and LAFOIP.	Yes, anyone going onto someone else's land needs to have written consent. If you are found on land not having permission, it should be considered trespassing. There are trails for the snowmobiles and ATV's.
Yes			
yes	All land should be treated the same	Permission should be from the land owner buy direct contact.	NO they need to ask permission also.
Yes , entering on any private property/residents/land , should require written permission	All agricultural land should be treated the same	Permission should be asked by the land owner , and if they do not know who the land owner is , ask the municipality or land owner that are near by , regardless if you can not contact land owner , you should not be on there property	Regardless of what activity it is , written permission should be required or asked, there is to much damage to property by recreational activity, like hunting, how would property owners in towns and city, like to have damaged to their property, laws governing access to property, should be the same as in urban as it in rural, I really don't understand why there laws between urban and rural are different
yes written permission	all land beyond a road allowance is private property	written permission	no bio security is a huge risk so it is necessary to for everything it is my understanding that treaties state first nation and metis need permission
The public should not be allowed to enter my property without my express consent regardless of the intended activities. The only two exceptions should be to go to my dwelling to see if an invitation is extended or to contain loose livestock that they own, or have permission to contain.	All land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. Just as I'm not allowed to drive my vehicle (or ATV/Sled) on a city lot, regardless of fencing or posting, I don't want uninvited persons in my fields. I shouldn't be required to bear the expense of a fence - it's my property. If they want a place to rip around - they should buy the land.	Take the main road and enter through our driveway to our residence. If we aren't home - permission is not extended. My cell phone and e-mail address are my confidential information and I don't want it posted.	Not my problem. They have access to ditches and trails. My neighbours, that I trust and have given permission to, will not be impacted. Again - if recreationalists want access to farmland - they can buy some farmland or get permission from people that trust them. As for hunters - I have pets, children, and livestock and don't want them hunting on our land and endangering my people and investments.
Yes!	All should be treated the same	Municipal office	
Yes	same	By written permission from the land owner and it should be given before they drive even on the Lane, in today's world, you can assess anyone electronically first.	no
			No
yes	treated the same!!!!	Written permission	No. Would i drive on your front lawn with a sled or quad? ( Sarcasm) !

yes	The same	Through the municipal office.. or a posted sign	No
Yes	All land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same	Contact landowners through municipal offices	Consent is not unreasonable. If a person wants or needs to be on someone's privately owned property, they should then plan ahead to ask said owner whether they can do certain recreational activities. For example: Currently we are unable to harvest our crop of oats as the land is too wet from the rain. I would like someone to ask permission to hunt on my land for example because they could ruin the crop.
Yes.	No distinction, all treated the same.	In writing, including letter, text, email, electronic message.	Maybe, but is pursuing recreational activities on my land a right?
Yes absolutely!!!!	All the same	Needs to be written permissions. People can get information from local RM office as to who owns or is renting land.	NO land owner bought and payed for land and payes the taxes it's for there use not everybody else.
Yes should first have permission before entering.	All the same.	Permission should be asked either by phone or in person.	Recreation should come second to agricultural enterprises. If we can't control access we have issues with bio security and fire hassards. The safety of our family's and our stock is also a concern.
Yes	Treated the same	Written	No
yes.	treated the same. If you do not own it you are trespassing.	The former. No publishing of emails. I don't mind if my RM gives out my phone number to hunters. I would be OK with that.	No it is not unreasonable to have them seek permission first. I don't snowmobile across their front lawn so why should they go across mine just because it is not in a town or city?
Yes they need permission to access rural properties.	It should be the same pasture cultivated and idle land should have permission.	They can buy a RM map and look it up.	Snowmobiles registered in Saskatchewan would be the only exception.
Yes		RM map and look for owner hunters are to lazy to ask.	Only snowmobiles registered Saskatchewan allowed.
Yes , permission has to be required .	All should be treated the same .	Permission should be sought but if the land owner doesnt want they party on his land then it is his right to deny access to that party .	No I don't think so . Asking permission and the owner knowing u are on his land may very well help prevent and injury or accident .
Yes, unless pursuing wounded game. And then by only most direct route possible, and still responsible for damage to fencing, crop if excessive.	Should all be treated the same	Any form of documentable communication. Texts, emails, written permission.	Possibly, but why would their rights trump land owners. They have right to have fun, the land owner has the right to restrict use to preserve the natural state, keep contamination away, and many other reasons. And they pay the tax on the land, who else should have the right to access, and to grant it if not the owner.
Perhaps but how will we get permission from owners who use a corporate # to register their land. That information is not easily available. This would destroy game management in areas that can't be accessed.	Should be all the same	There would have to be some type of landowner/occupier contact list. Anyone not registering their land and making themselves accessible should have to revert to properly posting their land. Failure to do one or the other should be considered implied consent.	It's not unmanageable but in the case of snowmobiles it seems quite excessive. It would make most recreational riding in the south where there are no trails, virtually non existent not to mention hard to enforce. We have trouble getting enforcement on the laws we have now. As far as hunting, I feel some areas will become overpopulated due to lack of access and the accessible areas will have no game.
No. I should remain as it is .	All the same.	Landowners/ farmers do not want to be bothered especially during the fall season ( hunting). They either post the land or not post it if they are not concerned.	This would affect the hunting heritage in the Province greatly. It is a pleasure not being like the U.S. and having places to hunt .
Yes	No	In person	No

<p>Yes. This is the only way that the public will comply with access expectations of the landowner or occupier. Too many people are accessing land of all types without any consent and are damaging, disturbing, and bringing invasives to our Prairies. The Public should be given the opportunity to access land in Saskatchewan, but ONLY by means of express permission from the rural land owner or occupier. It only makes good sense to protect our Prairie landscape in Saskatchewan. The Public are NOT educated or knowledgeable on our Prairie landscape and how to CARE for it like its' land owners and occupiers are, and thus, they MUST consult with the land owner or occupier to gain permission to access and guidance for how NOT to disturb or degrade the landscape. This is going to be an effort by all Saskatchewan residences, and if it is not required for the public to gain express permission for access you continue to divide land owners and the public and put our Saskatchewan Prairie at risk.</p>	<p>All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. Our most sensitive, sacred agricultural land in Saskatchewan is our Native Prairie (pastureland). It would be utterly foolish to leave this aspect of agricultural land unprotected from public disturbance, damage and degrading. It is the unauthorized access by public, atvers, snowmobilers, and hunters that poses such enormous risk to our Native Prairie because they do not understand how their tracks, garbage, spread of invasives, and fire risk can so negatively impact it. Only the requirement of express permission for ALL agricultural land (including pastureland) will aid in the protection of our Native Prairie landscape, and help prevent further degradation or loss or invasion.</p>	<p>Permission should be sought by the public contacting the land owner or occupier. This contact could be through any means of communication; however land owners or occupiers contact info should never be made public for privacy reasons. If the public is unable to find the contact info of the land owner or occupier, it should be their responsibility to travel to the yard or residence of the land owner and request permission to access. Once a request for access has been made, permission should ONLY be granted through written permission. This will avoid misunderstandings and the public being able to claim that they were 'TOLD' they could gain access.</p>	<p>Absolutely NOT. The current Trespass Act claims that it is an OFFENSE to enter land without the consent of the land owner or occupier. This is not changing the fact that the public is supposed to have CONSENT first. However, without enforcing a written permission clause and putting more teeth to the ACT, the public will continue to ignore the requirements and access land without permission. And, furthermore, the individuals of the public that have specific purpose for entry to the land and are conscientious of protecting the land as well (such as some hunters), already willingly seek consent to enter the land. And, in fact, those that would find this unreasonable are likely those same individuals that feel it is their right to be able to access land anywhere, anytime, and do anything that they feel; without any consideration of the negative impacts it could have on our Saskatchewan Prairie land.</p>
<p>Yes, anyone who wants to access privately owned land, regardless of activities, should receive permission from the landowner and/or person who is renting the land.</p>	<p>All property should be treated the same. Whether it be cultivated, pasture, or hayland, fenced or unfenced.</p>	<p>There are a couple ways that this could be done. Either verbal consent from the landowner, by phone or face to face. Or all landowners can submit a letter to their local RM office, which will give permission or not for people to access their land. Anyone wishing to access would then have to go to the RM office, which could potentially simplify receiving permission from the landowner.</p>	<p>In my opinion it shouldn't be unreasonable to ask permission.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Land is land and as such, Should all be treated the same.</p>	<p>Should be written permission only, it would be nice if was easier to access land owner contact information.</p>	<p>No, there is more then enough crown land, wildlife lands for recreation and hunting if someone doesn't want to go through the trouble to find the land owner.</p>
<p>You be [REDACTED] it should.</p>	<p>All agriculture land should be treated the same. Most importantly fenced property with livestock!!!!</p>	<p>Individuals should have direct contact face to face (most preferred) or at least a phone call identifying themselves and exactly what they need land access for and where they intend to access the property.</p>	<p>I do believe for sleding it would. As most people today drive wherever they please and cross 20-30 different landowners. That's allot of permission requests for a 3hr sled ride. But again...if property is fenced off they should have to ask permission to access it on any recreation machine or on foot.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>The same</p>	<p>Call ahead or ask at the house.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>By email or phone</p>	<p>Don't care</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>Should all be classified the same and disease and contamination could be detrimental to the land owners livelihood</p>	<p>Emails are impractical since many rural areas do not have service or people may not have email. Phone numbers would be the most practical and should posted within the municipality office or on a government website with specifically for land location</p>	<p>Yes since not everyone is familiar with all areas and may not gain the permission from the correct parties</p>
<p>Should always ask the land owners first before anything but only one person should come up to the door and car truck should be left in road</p>	<p>All</p>		
	<p>They should all be treated the same.</p>		
<p>Yes!! This year we have experienced two occasions in which vehicles have driven across our fields( one in standing wheat and one in swathed canola).</p>	<p>All land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Anyone requesting access onto private land must obtain written or verbal consent from the land owner to enter the land.</p>	<p>No.</p>

Totally agree with changing the legislation to this!	All land regardless if fenced, pasture or cultivated should be treated as "permission only access" as you've suggested changing the legislation.	People desiring access to someone else's property can get an RM map to determine who owns the property and then try and contact them. If they can't reach them then they will not be able to access the property (as the default should be).	No I don't believe so. I would be ok if snowmobiling was granted a special privilege.
yes	yes ag land NO trespassing	email would work as long as a picture(s) of person (s) are included	permission required
yes	yes	people should in no way go on any land before getting permission. It should be completely up to the trespasser to find the land owner before entering. There can not be a loophole for them to say that they are on the property already just looking for the land owner.	No it is the only way that it would work I am a land owner and am taking great measures to avoid the spread of Club Root and I certainly don't want some total stranger spreading it to my land. The cost to my operation could balloon into the millions. Who is going to compensate me for someone else's actions?
Yes any trespassing without written permission should be considered a offence signs too not cut it	All land should be considered the same trying to differ makes for too much grey area	Written only after a phone call that allows the individual to come too the main yard to obtain it	No it would not snowmobile clubs etc ask the landowner and users stay on the specied trails otherwise will be considered trespassing if get off it
Yes	All land should be treated the same	By the most direct route to the inhabited residence	No it would not
Yes.			
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	I would like the land owners to have the opportunity to put their email on their rm maps. They should have the option not to post any contact info if they desire.	
Hi I am a land owner in the [redacted] and I understand the concerns of bioscurity and in general use of quads mostly on private land being a problem. As ownership of these thing has become more normal than not there are a lot of quads snow machines and even four wheel drive vehicles almost everyone has rural or urban . But Sask is a special place a place u like any other where we have a good system a system where access can be used by people if people don't care. if they do I feel it should be up too the land owner too post land properly according to what he wants or doesn't want one his or her land. As a rural person trying too raise livestock we come too what I feel a growing problem with predators and also rodents . Ow I do relise it may be possible and even proper too ask for permission too hunt these animals but out here sometimes a person needs too react in the situation if land is posted then that's one thing but if not then people can remove these animals. I believe that if we go to no access land these animals Will flourish costing millions too crop insurance . Please consider hunt on foot only access or a supplies sign by municipality too land owners before making a blanket ruling. I feel there are better ways for us too accomplish this concern than a trespassing law truly we have the best of both worlds now. I k ow things are changing but I hope my kids can grow up experiencing Sask the way I knew it . [redacted]	Treated the same	No only if land is posted as such	Yes
Yes!	All land should be treated the same, private property is private property	Permission should be sought by getting a contact phone number from the municipal office or an email. Then the owner can be contacted and consent can be given. It would be in the best interest of the person entering the property to obtain this in writing.	No it does not. If you ask for consent the owner can make you aware of possible hazzards, Which makes activities safer.

I am an avid outdoorsmen and prefer to hunt on public land (forest) for a number of reasons. One reason being is the conflict that so many seem to have when trying to gain access onto private land. One such example is those landowners that have prime hunting land which borders forest land. They seem to think they have exclusive hunting privileges to both the access to the forest (if road allowances are unclear or broken up or blocked) and subsequently have exclusive access to the game that is in that area. That is just ONE example I have seen hunters encounter. I understand that a lot of game do feed on crop lands and so I feel for the landowners if they are having crop damaged by game animals or birds but then see over and over again they deny others access onto their land which may well aid in the helping the situation, it leaves the impression they simply want exclusive access which seems unfair to those who come from larger urban communities. So we look to public lands and this then puts more pressure on the accessible public lands (those that are not leased or managed and closed to access ) so we all congregate in tighter and tighter quarters which seems to be causing more and more confrontations as a result and that's not good. What further fuels the divide in the outdoorsmen community is the discussions around the coffee shop of those gloating over their prizes after the hunt, who very often are from the "local club" and who have access. Then many are left frustrated trying to find a place to enjoy the outdoors and the public wildlife which is all of ours and managed by our public funds. I feel for the landowners and the various challenges that go with the access problems and subsequent damage and when I see blatant abuses and damage it angers me to see it and be labeled in the same group. I was raised and raised my family on wild game and bird for substance and it is something I hope is around for ALL in this province for generations, not just those lucky enough to own land or be related to them. Its a tough problem to address and the last thing I want to see people encounter is to inadvertently wonder out onto private land bordering public land and be picked up on some trail camera and face a fine for a honest mistake, that wouldn't be right. And lets not forget the "outfitters" who have "privileges" by landowners, but that's another story.	No difference in my opinion.	Person to person with written permission is the only way I can see it working as to not cause doubt. Perhaps SK ENVIRONMENT could create a template and post on the website that can be printed off for those wanting to use which would contain the needed information with provisions that each one using it could tailor it to a specific situation.	Sure it will, and it seems strange that it is needing to be addressed now when farms are getting bigger and bigger with less smaller farms in the rural settings and the mixed small to average family farm as we used to know them are going by the way of the dinosaurs. And who controls the right of access those who own the land, those that rent the land in cases where land is rented out? I see this causing issues as well amongst land owners and renters, they have to sort that out. And for those that are snowmobilers that want to head off for a ride in the country, well find a groomed trail now or your weekend is going to be spoiled. It seems it is yet another case of a few causing problems which leads those controlling the vast to restrict the multitude. Sad but true! It might be nice to have a means (database) where one could submit their name, contact info., area wanting to hunt and species they wish to hunt where those who would consider allowing hunters access to their land to have wildlife management numbers controlled through hunter harvest means could hook up somehow. They might find out a lot of us are pretty honest, respectful, caring people!
YES	There needs to be no distinction. All land should be treated the same	Contact information should be sought through the Municipal Offices and permission from the landowner granted by written permission or expressed permission through text, email, fax, etc.	No.
The land owner or leasee should have the right to refuse and restrict access to land under their care and control	All land should be treated the same	Use main access point	No consent should be required
Yes	Yes	Writing, text or email , verbal last choice as it doesn't eliminate conflict	Too bad, I will come quad, snowmobile and hunt in city properties
Yes	All land should be treated the same yes.	By telephone or in person	Yes because the city folks would get mad if I quad across their lawn so why should they be allowed to go across mine in the country
Yes	The same	Contacting landowner before entering land via phone	No
Yes it should	All treated the same	If your hunting you can come to my door and ask for permission Anything else there should be a map at the RM office with a each field highlighted that the owner allows access to them	No.... my land, no permission no access
Yes	No	I would like an e-mail asking permission explaining their purpose for accessing my land along with the identity of persons requesting permission	It may be an impediment but but in today's world I believe it is necessary.
Yes, I think so. It can sometimes be a pain to post all land correctly. Sometimes signs don't stay up or get blown away.	All land should be the same	Through an RM office or iHunter app.	No, it shouldn't
Yes		By phone or a visit	
Yes they should ask for permission before entering someone's property or land. Would I be allowed to enter their back yard, house, garage without permission?	If you do not own it why should you be able to use or access it without permission?	In my experience with land ownership if someone is respectful and the type of person you would on your land they will find a way to get in touch with you.	Why is it unreasonable to ask for permission before going on someone's land? Can I walk into anyone's back yard and use their pool or just hang out ?!
Yes they need permission	All land being used for agriculture should be treated the same.	Permission should granted by any means needed to get in contact with the land owner	No . It gives the land owner the right to protect their property from recreational activity

<p>this would work if RM maps are updated yearly so that permission can be asked as land changes frequently. Does the owner or renter have final say in the access.</p>	<p>I think open land should be treated the same but there should be a better way of contacting owners and or renters of the property.</p>	<p>Land could have a sign at corners with phone number or email for contact and RM maps should be updated annually and before hunting season. RM maps should have renters name also.</p>	<p>yes</p>
<p>no, definitely not. the land owner or its proxy may not be readily available. sounds fear driven or suggestive.</p>	<p>all the same. keep it simple</p>	<p>telephone or text or any modern electronic communications. keep it simple.</p>	<p>definitely. people like their routines &amp; would have to change traditions because "some affluent" people are scared of different people &amp; pass legislation for more security. it's not the 60's anymore.</p>
<p>Yes, I believe it should.</p>	<p>I think all land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Not sure</p>	<p>I don't believe so. If you don't own the land you shouldn't be on it without permission.</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>treated the same</p>	<p>oral or written</p>	<p>Not my problem. Permission should be granted.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Treated the same</p>	<p>Verbal if refused should leave property</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>In personal, phone, text or email</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes, the public has a duty to the landowner to ensure that they acquire permission before use regardless of the activity. To ensure that this is possible, the landowners should post a contact number or mailing address at one point on the quarter. Failure by the public to abide by this is an offence and should be punishable by a fine regardless of the activity save for if there is currently a risk or danger to someone's life.</p>	<p>All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same as this would include land currently being left fallow. However, the legislation should clearly state all forms of land use.</p>	<p>As previously mentioned, contact information should be posted on-site. If a landowner is not comfortable with this, the landowner's information may leave their information with the municipal office where the administrators will contact the landowners rather than the individuals. Approaching a dwelling should only be done via an easily recognizable path. If there is a fence or gate (Texas style gate included) present and consent has yet not been obtained, any further onto the land would be considered trespassing. Permission to all lands should not be considered permanent and those seeking use shall clarify how long they are requesting permission.</p>	<p>No. If one is simply seeking a shorter route from A to B on a recreational vehicle, then consent must be obtained from the landowner. If an individual failed to seek permission from the landowner prior to access and must pay a fine, a landowner should be granted the ability to retroactively grant permission and have the fine waived.</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>All ag land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Granted by proof; written note with reason, by e-mail with reason ,with time frame.</p>	<p>No, it would not.</p>
<p>Yes. You should not be able to enter someone else's land without permission.</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Find out who's land you want to find on an r.m map and then contact the land owner.</p>	<p>No. There are ditches snowmobilers can ride in when they did not seek permission to be on the land.</p>
<p>No.</p>	<p>Same.</p>	<p>Freely available property maps with land owner phone numbers must be provided. Digital apps with GPS information supplemented with land owner information are available in other provinces to aid this process and should be provided if the regulations change.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>No - I think the present system works.</p>	<p>Treated the same.</p>	<p>In today's electronic age. Emails, texts, phone calls are all possibilities. As well as direct contact.</p>	<p>I suspect it would for hunting in the Sothern portion of the province where habitat can be sparse over vast areas.</p>

<p>No. Foot access for hunting should still be allowed. Not just for First Nations and Metis who may hold treaty rights. Risk to farms are negligible with foot access and there is no risk from fire to rural properties. It will severely restrict hunting opportunities in the province for resident hunters.</p>	<p>There should be a distinction. Why can't Saskatchewan keep Manitoba's model, rather than what they use in Alberta. Foot access to open pasture land or cultivated land where the crop has been picked up and harvested should be allowed.</p>	<p>Permission should be sought and granted verbally (by phone) or by electronic means (email or text). Otherwise, it becomes virtually impossible to gain access to land for hunting purposes. Ethical hunters have doing this for decades and it has worked well. Requiring written permission only creates further paranoia in rural Saskatchewan. We need to make people feel more at ease, not more paranoid.</p>	<p>Yes, it would prohibit certain types of hunting (foot access for upland game bird hunting). Most rural landowners do not mind hunters on foot accessing hedgerows for upland game bird hunting after the crop has been harvested on non-posted land.</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Yes there should be a distinction</p>		<p>Yes for sure it would be an impediment to recreational activities. I am a hunter and seek permission to access land. It is getting more and more difficult to do so with the change in land ownership demographics...fewer landowners, corporations owning large tracts of land.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All treated the same</p>	<p>Telephone first the appropriate owner/lessor followed by written consent second to complete</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>YES PLEASE</p>	<p>All land be the same. Keep it simple. It's like kindergarten, teach them to ask for permission and if it's not yours you can't just use it or in this case go on it! You really need to dumb it down for some people.</p>	<p>I support a process of going through the RM office. Much safer than having random people knocking on doors.</p>	<p>No, as u mentioned there is no legal entitlement to access private property. Land owners should not have to fence every acre of land that they own and it is ridiculous that land owners have to post "keep off" signs. Please think about this.... is it more important that ranchers and farmers make a living, or is it more important that we allow residents to recreationalists to do whatever they want??? Common sense please! You have to remember who owns the land and who is paying taxes on the land.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same</p>	<p>By contacting the landowner by phone or in person</p>	<p>If it's not your land you shouldn't be on it without permission so you need to plan ahead...not the landowners problem.</p>
<p>yes, they should all get permission prior to entering private land</p>	<p>All Landed should be treated the same. As some years we as farmers graze land that may be temporarily fenced, that was cultivated crop land. and vice versa. Farm property is farm property, permission should be decided by the land owner, no matter the status.</p>	<p>I am currently on ████████ in Sk. A fair amount of out of province hunters do stop into the RM office and buy maps and inquire info from the administrator as well. I think that this would be the best if they are interested in hunting on private land to inquire thru the RM for contact info. Sad part is that the "LOCAL" hunters are the most ignorant and rude trespassers!!! Hard to train them and the First Nations as well.</p>	<p>In previous years we have had winter crops. It was posted that there was winter wheat and fall rye. BUT, snowmobilers and ATV er's chose to drive right past the sign and continue to drive on land that was posted. Not a care at all that we had our livelihood under that snow. OF COURSE it had winter kill tracks in the spring from the sled and bikes. Because this land is sometimes not accessed by vehicle in the winter, they feel they can just go wild and go where they please. If they respect the posting of land and get permission, and act civilized when on rec vehicles it would not be such a big problem.</p>

Yes. This change is long overdue and is needed to ensure respectful use of land by all.	All land that is used for agricultural uses should be treated the same, whether cultivated, fenced or open	If enhanced / email access is offered by the landowners themselves (ie the landowner forwards their contact info to a municipal office) then I believe that is a good method to assist in gaining consent. But I do not believe landowners should be forced to provide that info. I strongly support accessing an inhabited residence from a main access point. I live in a city and if someone unknown to my came over my fence or through my back gate into my yard I would be calling the police. Why should rural landowners have to put up with similar actions by those seeking to use their land?	Making consent an express prerequisite prior to access is a reasonable requirement. Private land should be respected as such. Therefore mandating express permission would not be an overt impediment to their activities. Recreationalists such as snowmobilers and atv users have many trails that can be used year round for their express use. Hunters gain access to private lands many times using common sense methods of gaining landowners' approval (as explicitly taught in the provincial hunter safety course). Those recreationalists who trespass on private land are often simply too lazy to bother seeking out and contacting the landowner. This small minority undermines the support and acceptance these landowners might have had for the majority that treats private land with respect.
Yes. The Alberta model would provide a better basis for understanding by land owners and the public.	All agricultural land should be treated the same whether it is fenced or not. As was previously raised bio security risks are increasing and could be catastrophic to the agricultural industry as is being seen in Alberta.	A municipal registry could be established at the local office in which land owners could register land with their contact information if they want to grant consent. Otherwise they would register that the land does not grant access.	The biosecurity risks should outweigh any recreational interests as the economic impacts would affect all the residents of Saskatchewan.
Yes. We have experienced Snow Mobile and ATV damage to fields and especially fall seeded crops by hunters and the general public.	All agricultural land should be treated the same. We as Organic producers have a 28 foot grass border around our property that is not visible in winter but is there to prevent noxious weed spread unto our property by ATV's, Snow Machines and other vehicles. Hunters on foot especially need permission.	Seek landowner contact through municipal offices and then contact through telephone or email. Crossing property lines to obtain permission is too open ended.	No. Once clearance to access the property can be established, most likely the landowner could direct to certain areas to visit. For example nature viewing, camping and special scenery.
yes	no distinction with regard to purpose of use or distance from residence	consider building an on line map in conjunction with municipal offices. Every quarter section could be identified as "red" no go, unless occupant identifies through municipal office to identify their holdings "yellow" for permission required or "green" fair game. access to map would be available with smart phone	no
no As a farmer I feel that it is easier to post my land and then the police know that the person on the land has to have permission. The police are going to assume that the person has permission if the law is change unless they get a complaint. I feel that it will give people a reason to come into my yard to ask permission so they can look around my yard to see what they can take. They will just say they where in your yard looking for permission if you are not home.	yes	the person asking permission should have a card that you can sign. or a text saying they have permission	yes
	Should be all the same	Person wanting to go on land should contact land owner first to get permission	No recreational activities should get permission also from land owners skidoo clubs do in my area
Yes	All land treated the same	Email would be fine	
Yes	All the same	Email	No
Yes	Access to all rural land should fall under the same rules.	By phone call when possible. I don't want strangers coming to my house when I'm home alone with small children on the farm. It's easy enough to find out someone's phone number/contact information in a rural area. That small effort should be required. In person at our residence when necessary.	People's recreational activities are their responsibility, not mine. It's up to them to find a place to do these activities, and if they can't legally find anywhere, they should choose a different activity. My ownership of my land should in no way come second to someone's desire for fun.
Yes	Yes	In person or by phone	

No. To do so will for the most part be the end of snowmobiling in Sask. I don't see the same concern regarding weed or disease contamination from sleds travelling over the snow. Is there a law that precludes farmers from travelling with loaded non-tarped trucks/trailers or combines that were not cleaned between fields especially during harvest. Is their laws against moving farm equipment from field to field without cleaning and washing? These activities also spread weeds and disease and likely a lot more than from walking or sledding across the field.	If the intention is to restrict access in the absence of having express permission either in writing or otherwise than there should be a distinction made for different land and also for varying types of public access.	Again this would kill snowmobiling and a significant amount of hunting in the province if such a proposal for permission were made law. How is it that the government is prepared to transfer the fate of our provincial wildlife into the hands of the landowners?	I expect most farmers don't really care and those who do already post their land. Yes I feel that this is a very unreasonable impediment and would kill most of these activities.
Yes I believe no public access should be allowed, without the landowner having to post any private land, for any and all purposes. No written permission, absolutely no access.. Access without permission equals trespassing and a fineable offence in my opinion	Separating the private land into classes will only create gray areas within the act. If it is changed to any and all private land, no matter what the use, I believe it will be a more clear cut law and be much easier for landowners to enforce.	If the permission is solely for hunting/trapping, I don't see why the hunter/trapper couldn't find the name on a map and find a phone number for the landowner, without ever having to enter the property first	As someone that hunts/traps/snowmobiles/atv's, I don't see any problem with it being considered trespassing to do any activity at any point in the year if you don't have written permission/consent to be on the property. Mainly to keep unwanted trespassers off all property and there be no liability for injury on the landowner if there is unwanted access
ya	no	?	yes
Yes	No	Yes	Owners safety vs rec use ? Owners interests trump other uses so No!
yes	yes	Phone, social media	no
No. I think if landowners do not want people on their land they NEED to post it. Or maybe they just want to know who's on their land they can post signage stating "permission required to access land" along with a phone number to call. I don't think by saying all land now requires permission is going to stop alot of people from accessing it.			
Yes	All treated the same	Email availability by permission only so the RM can relay it to the individual needing permission	No
No	Yes	When the landowners are encounter	Yes
yes	yes all treated the same	The individual seeking access should have permission before going on the land by attending on site inhabited residence or prior phone call by the most direct route from mail access point.	No it would not represent an impediment to their activities and making consent an express prerequisite prior to access is not an unreasonable impediment
absolutely YES	All land should be treated the same. It is privately owned so should be respected the same whether it is fenced or not.	Contact information could be available through RM offices as they would have to inquire who owns the land they are interested in hunting on or purchasing maps at the same time.	Not unreasonable at all, I wouldn't skidoo through someone's private yard without permission. It should be common courtesy and with the spread of clubroot and other soil spread problems it is a major issue for agriculture producers to have ATVs on their land without knowing where they have come from.
Yes	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same	They should call the land owners or talk to them in person at their main residence. I do not agree with e-mails.	No it does not
Yes	Yes it should dictate between cultivated, fenced and open pasture land.	Ensure RM's are posting land owner names on RM maps, have landowners provide the RM with the best contact # and then anyone wanting access may be able to get access	No, because its easy to ask for permission.
Yes. The RMs could keep a list of contact numbers so that hunters would be able to contact land owners.	No. All agricultural lands should be treated the same. In many cases the land owner will warn hunters or others of potential dangers and indicate where the gates are located.	Hunters can access the property owner's residence by the main roads in order to request access. If no one is home the RM could keep a list of phone numbers of the land owners as a secondary avenue of contact. These numbers and/or contact information provided and approved by the land owner.	No. All access should be cleared by the land owners first. That way the safety of those wishing to access the land would be improved. They would be told where they can and cannot go, and where the access gates are located. Many now simply cut fences and run over areas that are off limits. Spreading of disease and weeds would also be more easily controlled by the land owner.
Yes	No	Through RM offices	Require prior permission to ANY activity

Yes	All land be treated the same.	By any means of communication, phone,text, email mostly verbal permission but in cases of hunting where a firearm is used it should be written and written could be a text or email from landowner/operator.	No most serious recreationalists would plan there activities and places to go so would ask for permission to enter land
No, access for hunting/fishing should remain as is. If not posted then access is allowed. Perhaps, using a vehicle on that land for the purpose of hunting/fishing should require written permission.	All agricultural land should be treated the same, as per first answer to first question	If land is posted no hunting/fishing then permission should be obtained directly from the landowner, or in some cases the leasee. The resource user is responsible for obtaining and carrying up to date RM maps.	Yes, it is a very unreasonable impediment.
Yes- often times we feel our livestock ( cattle and horses ) as well as our own safety ( horseback riding - fencing) is jeopardized during hunting season. We have stopped doing required work because of fear for our safety. In addition off road vehicle tracks are an issue.	All land should be treated the same.	1. Through the RM or RM maps - perhaps landowners would need to ask R M administrator to share this information. 2. RM maps and phone listings - this is problematic as cell phone numbers are not readily available.. 3. When feasible person to person communication at the home as then we could know who is hunting where should gates be left open, off road activities have taken place or livestock disturbed.	As a landowner this is a no brainer. It is private property . I would not say my party has been ruined because I didn't get permission to use your deck and barbecue .
Yes	All treated the same	Maybe the landowner could give R. M. s. permission to give out phone numbers if in favour of hunting. Contact by technology might be better than face to face	As a landowner i don't feel i need to supply a place for recreation people to play. I don't make a habit of driving on lawns and gardens.
Yes	All land treated the same	Find owners name on rm maps and Contact rural municipalities and ask them for owners phone number. All rm maps should be easily accessible online.	No it wouldnt as there is road allowance/ditches that are not public owned so all recreational vehicles can drive in ditches.
Unsure	all the same	must be written	no always the bad apples apple that ruin it for most
Yes	All treated the same	In person and in writing	No
No	No it should all be treated the same	phone and written permission	Yes
YES	TREATED THE SAME	WRITTEN	NO
YES	SAME	By going directly to yard site via yard site driveway access only	no
No	No. Crown land that is leased from the government should not have the same restrictions that private, deeded land has	Telephone or by asking in person via the most direct route to the residence unless there is notification not to enter the property.	Yes
yes.It should not be a treaty right of any race or color to automatically have access to private land that that owner had to pay for and pay taxes every year on	all private land should need permission to enter	every rm has maps and names on those lands and everyone now days has cell phones.i think permission must be carried in writing before entry	I think it should be mantitory
yes	should be treated the same	if local/knows owner verbal others should get written permission	it is not unreasonable. If people would respect private property and not cut fences and gates, there wouldn't be a demand for stricter rules

No	All the land treated the same.	The landowner should be required to provide phone numbers and email addresses available to the public so that access can be obtained beyond a normal business day. There should also be timelines when the landowner has to reply to the person requesting permission.	If you bring this legislation into affect in will be the end of sport hunting in the province for Saskatchewan resident hunters. Between outfitters and non-resident hunters from the USA they will pay landowners for access and essentially tie up all the private land leaving the resident no where to hunt. It will be a case of the man with the most money wins. If you need proof look at a lot of the jurisdictions in the US to see how the access land. They pay for it. This attitude has been brought to our province and the outfitters are now using it. Landowners know they can't charge for hunting so they call their payment from outfitters or non-residents a garbage can fee, parking fee or some other fee. Please don't do this. The people who are trying to propose this change are obviously not SK hunters otherwise they would understand this proposal if implemented will be the end of resident hunting in SK unless you're wealthy.
yes, but all RM maps should be free to download online so that people have reasonably easy access to the owners information.	no all should be treated the same	in person going to the landowners yard, by phone, text, or email. once again info should be easily accessible for the common person so that a line of communication can be found easily	no people should respect others property
██████████ I think it is unfair for me to need permission while everyone else doesn't. There are sections and sections of stubble with no fences and no farm sites and no one living for miles. I am the one who must have a good relationship with farmers to maintain my business so I am unlikely to damage their land or do something unethical. Non-resident hunters are the problem. I think they should need permission but not SK residents.	The distinctions listed are not practical. Fields change year to year. Therefore, they should be treated the same	Written permission is a scary thing to most landowners. They feel like it makes them liable, etc. Phone conversation id the most practical	yes
Yes.	All land land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same and entry onto to the land should be prohibited unless permission has been granted.	Calling the land owner on the telephone or requesting permission via email. Or attending the inhabited residence via the most direct route from a main access point.	No. It is my belief, as a rural landowner, that we would actually be more willing to give consent to recreational activities if we were allowed the opportunity to know who is participating in those activities on our land. The way the Act is currently written allows for a certain amount of seeming entitlement to access our land, and that entitlement makes it difficult to know who is on our land and limits our ability to keep our livestock, family and land safe. So, for us, it is easier just to not allow any access. If it was standard procedure for people wishing to engage in recreational activities to ask permission before going onto our land, and we were able to know who is on our land and have express input into keeping our animals, land and family safe - we would be much more willing to do so and allow them their recreational activities.
Yes.	No	All ways of permission should be accessed and posted for all.	This must include trappers and northern land-users, all stakeholders not just southern users.

Yes	All land used for agriculture purpose should be treated the same. In addition, any rural land that is being used for any purpose other than agriculture should also require permission from the owner to enter.	If someone seeking permission can't obtain permission without accessing the property to seek said permission, they should not have permission. If the land owners wish to have people seek permission they can list their phone numbers, emails, etc. I will personally not list my phone number publicly for this very reason. Permission should not be implied and I also don't want strangers calling me.	No. Recreational activities on someone else's property are a privilege, not a right. I always obtained permission to snowmobile and quad from landowners prior to the internet and cell phones. It was easy then, and it's easier now.
Yes	Yes it should	Written, texts should be considered legal documents	Yes
Yes	No distinction	Permission should be sought from the landowner, either in person, or via telephone.	I don't think it would be an unreasonable impediment.
Yes	yes	It should be written permission - signed & dated including how long it is valid for	Recreational vehicles have govt land (ditches etc) to drive on therefore it would not be unreasonable
Yes!!! I do not want people on my property without permission. I live on 400 acres. One mile is bordered by a RM road which is well travelled. I can't monitor activity on that road at all times. There have been instances where fences are cut and livestock has escaped and been hurt. Trespassers leave garbage on my property. Trespassers hunt on my property even though it is posted with no hunting and no trespassing signs. If I hear a gunshot, I am afraid to go to where the shot came from, not knowing what kind of reaction I will get when I ask the person to leave. The police are not close. I live by myself.	All land should be treated the same whether it contains livestock, is cultivated or fenced for any purpose, is recreational and fenced or not. Private property is private property.	It is my basic human nature to want to trust individuals but I live by myself and don't want people I don't know driving into my yard to ask for access. I know and am aware of the people who have permission to be on my land. There is no reason for anyone else to have access to land I own or occupy, so why do they need to approach my residence to ask for permission to be on my land? I can be found on google or facebook if someone wants to call ahead.	There is no reason for the general public to have access to the land I own and occupy for recreational purposes. If I open my riding or ski trails or my facility to the public, it will be on a specific day and time. Anyone who wants access any other time can call ahead.
yes	yes	phone or e-mail	no
no	yes there be a distinction between cultivated land, fenced property and open pasture land	it may be difficult. An effort should be made.	yes
yes	all should be treated the same	Face to face or verbally by telephone. Access should be by municipal roads and main driveways	No permission should just be a normal prerequisite.
No, hunting and most summer activities can certainly have a impact on the rural landscape, however snowmobiling and traveling across the open rural areas in the winter has very little or no effect. All fenced and post areas should be respected and not be travelled on. Snowmobiling should be treated differently than other ATV activities.	Fenced property could be treated differently than open pasture or open range land. Cultivated farm land should not be accessed during the summer season.	Permission could be sought in two ways, in person or through emails.	For snowmobilers, having to gain permission to cross open land during the winter months would be a major impediment.
Yes, that should be the system in place	All ag land should be treated the same	Direct route to home on property. Posting phone numbers should be recommended. Some kind of written document should be required as proof for enforcement. This will help in not requiring farmers to take the stand. Many wont testify in legitimate trespassing cases as when they do their bale stacks "coincidentally" are at risk of burning or other acts of vandalism. A text or email would suffice in my opinion as written permission. Just verbal however becomes difficult to deal with.	I do not believe it does. As a hunter I do this already. It is a recommendation in our guide just not law. Plus could reduce public danger when it comes to accidents with machinery or other things on the property. (Electric fence and snowmobile collisions or trucks hitting equipment buried in the snow) Plus this will help prevent the spread of club root and other invasives. Also I think it is only fair all stakeholders have the same requirements. (First Nations hunters already have this requirement)
Yes	Yes, all the same.	Must seek permission at front door.	No, good and honest people will always go to the owner for permission.
No	No	Telephone or stop at residence	Yes

Yes, in order for the owner or occupier to know if a person or persons have caused damage to their property they will have to allow those people access and know who is accessing their land.	It should all be treated the same.	Anyone who is crossing land or looking to gain access to land should have to go through the Rural Municipal office the land is located in. Find the land owners name and possibly a contact number(if permission is granted by land owner to RM to release that information) and contact them that way.	No, most snowmobilers or atv-ers plan trips ahead of time and would gain permission before they head out.
yes private property is private property no matter how big it is or where it is	All of it should be treated the same	Written permission of the landowner or current renter obtained by contact with those individuals in a reasonable and logical manner...an audio recording could be given to a recording device such as a cell phone...a text from said owners is reasonable	recreational activity on private land is trespassing...unless permission is granted...no one builds a campfire on the premier,s lawn
No.	I think that there should be a distinction. I would consider cultivated land to be land used to grow crops for an income, fenced land to include someone's yard (lawn and/or garden), and open pasture to include land that is used for livestock (regardless of the type of fence).	Having easy access to emails and phone numbers is a good idea (on RM maps). I also think that having easy access to up to date RM maps would also be beneficial; i.e. freely accessible online (or possibly using HAL numbers as a membership of sorts) and printable so as to avoid a scenario where land changes hands and permission is granted by someone other than the actual land owner.	Yes it certainly would. It is hard enough trying to find the time to get out and have fun without needing to contact half the country in case you might want to cross some land.
Yes	Yes all land treated the same.	Permission should be sought out by asking the land owner or resident of the property. Then if granted it should be in writing.	It would most likely impeded recreational activities but when considering how for example clubroot is spread and the detrimental affect that could have on agricultural producers lively hood it would be worth the effort to save our lands from disease.
Yes	All privately owned land should be treated the same		No.
Yes to all but known visitors	Yes	Any means possible	Certain types pf access ie: crossing landowners land for the purpose of crossing ie snowmobile derby can be over looked but for the purpose of hunting permission to to access must be granted
Yes	All treated the same	Ability to have access to enhanced access would be great	I don't think it would be unreasonable impediment
access only with prior consent, except to doorway.	No distinction including no distinction if private land is used for agriculture or other purposes (ie. nature preserve etc.)	By direct access or buy an RM map & phone/write/E-mail-they have an app for that.	NO. Restricting access is founded on biosecurity, invasive species, fire and wildlife disturbance risks and are identical for all uses and through-out the year
Yes	Should be the same it's the point of trespassing on land not the use of the land that matters. That would be like saying I can trespass into your house if your not raising children. But if there are children being raised in the house the it's illegal!	Either verbal or written	It wouldn't make it unreasonable but would make defined access points to crown land.

NOBODY should have free access to anybody else's property without their complete authorization! How do people think that nobody can cross my lawn in the city but I can cross someone else's "lawn" just because it is bigger! People have NO RESPECT	No! Their property is THEIR PROPERTY. Why should a landowner have to go through all of that expense (and it's a BIG EXPENSE) to keep people off of their own property. It is still THEIR PROPERTY period!	Of course ... those seeking permission need to stay on the access road. Why wouldn't they? An email or a text (from the landowner's email or cell phone or written permission should suffice	Recreationalists have been enjoying such recreation at the impediment of landowners all this time! I believe that the landowner even has a risk of someone suing him/her if the recreationalist is hurt on their property in some situations ( I was told this so I am not sure if it is true). Fact is NOBODY can take their quad on my lawn or start a bonfire or etc so NOBODY should have access without authorization on someone else's property. With cell phones and smart phones everybody can find who owns the property easily and can almost always reach the owner. And ... people who go snowmobiling for the day should have their route planned out in advance anyway! Why should a landowner be at the "bottom of the food chain" so to speak??
Yes	All treated the same	By phone call or in person	No
Yes	All should be treated the same on any private property	Permission should be granted before the individual comes onto the property whether by phone or email etc. Municipal offices should be allowed to give them this info	I dont think so. Consent ensures that the property owner is aware of people on his property for safety concerns etc.
NO, in a lot of instances it very difficult to find out who actually owns the land. Even if you do find out they can be very hard to get in touch with, especially if you are out on an ATV ride and covering lots of land.	All land cannot be treated equal. Fenced property with closed gates that probably contains livestock need to be treated differently than open cropland especially after the crops are off.	Everyone has a cell phone, post the number by the gate or driveway to the land. The owner can be texted or called for permission to access the land he can ask the requester what he wants to do on his land. If the owner does not see the number of the requester on his phone he does not have to grant permission. The text can be saved as proof by both parties. Email would work the same way. A lot of rural farm couples may both work off farm during the day and going to the house does not work. Also having to go to the door every time someone wants on the land would be very annoying.	When riding a snowmobile or ATV or can cover 50 to 100 miles in a day of riding. If you need permission every half mile from field to field is unreasonable. Especially after the crops are off and there is snow on the ground.
Yes, everyone should need prior permission to access land. There also needs to stiff penalties that can be enforced to encourage people to get the permission. Our province should be a leader and have stiffer penalties than other provinces, not just meet other provinces	All agriculture land should be treated the same. Especially when soil born diseases are becoming much more of an issue. As a landowner, I take care of my land in regards to weeds and disease and don't need others spreading these problems if I feel that there vehicles may contain something that could contaminate my soils	Being able to access landowners information through municipal offices would be ideal. Seeking out a homestead should only be done by roads, not crossing land and trespassing.	Again the issue with ATV and snowmobiles is the transmission of soil born diseases. This applies, ore the atvs than to snowmobiles but the same rules should exist for both to avoid confusion. Access to recreational vehicles should be given by the land owner, permission should be requested. A farmer could still have crop under the snow or maybe the soil is to wet and damage could be done to the land by atvs.
YES YES YES!	ALL LAND owned by an individual should be treated the same ... even if it is "waste land"	Yes to directly down main access to residence. I'm sure landowners should be open to providing cell numbers and if not that means they would not allow access	I have hunted and gone snowmobiling and I have ALWAYS asked for permission first. I don't know why people would not do so
yes	There should be no distinction between any lands that are privately owned,leased or rented regardless of what it is used for.	By direct contact in person, by phone or by e-mail.	If there are pre-determined routes established by clubs that have authorized permission to cross, that is ok but they must stay on that trail. Any others, individuals or private groups require permission

yes	all land treated the same	either direct contact or phone ,e-mail also talk to rm if not sure who land owner is by direct contact with rm employees or maps	yes we have had crops driven over by atv operators without regard to damage done, never was bothered by people driving across land after crop was of, but having crop damaged without regard now would like to see consent to enter anytime many are urban people and would not like some one using there urban property without regard.
No.	Only c, when farm animals are on the land.	All RM maps should be available online with a legal address for all landowners, to facilitate access requests	Yes.
yes	all treated the same	Ask at RM office	no it wont, private land is private land. Use trails provided
YES! YES! And yes again. Tired of the crop damage and sense of entitlement that people have.	Treat it all the same. Less confusing.	For years, perhaps decades, Responsible Hunters have found ways to get permission. Overthinking this.	No. As a farmer, hunters have found ways to contact me. As a rural resident, I still ATV and snowmobile without trespassing.
No, if they don't want you there it should be posted as such.	All the same, other then within 500 m if a yard, buildings, corrals	All RM maps must have current owner and address and phone numbers	Again 500 m rule, ban all atvs unless written permission
Object. Land owners should put up "no trespassing/no entry" signs if they do not want anyone on there land.	All land owners should have visible signs posted if they so not want anyone on there land.	All land owners should have visible signs posted if they do not want anyone on there land.	All land owners should have visible signs posted if they so not want anyone on there land.
No. Practice shows that wildlife do not wait for hunters and change their location constantly, so obtaining a permission often means an unnecessary step.	Should be all treated the same - HUNTING ON FOOT ONLY. Absolutely no vehicles.	Preferably online, or by texting, and record kept as proof.	The regulation should be more specific! Often the signs mean no hunting with bullets, eg. no hunting of deer. Reason is simple - safety of the residents, who have their residence on the property, or have livestock. But some people simply want to hunt grouse, ducks, or rabbits. Or to take pictures, or to hike. Many landowners don't want people to hunt deer, but almost everybody is happy when they shoot coyotes.
I think that posting land is a very simple solution to let people know you would not like them on your land. However updated RM Maps that could be readily available online would help a member of the public properly track down a land owner in order to seek permission. Currently RM Maps are only available from the RM offices and are typically out of date by multiple years.	Once again, simply posting land would let a person know that they would not like you on said land. All land typically could be treated the same way		
For the most part yes. However how would one garner permission without the ability to enter the property?	All private land regardless of what it is being used for should be off limits except to people that have obtained permission.	Direct access to an inhabited building would suffice. If there is no occupied dwelling or place of business or if the landowner wishes not to have anyone enter the property, then it should be incumbent upon the land owner to supply a reasonable method of contact by means of signage at the property's main access point. A singular sign.	no. Further the requirement for permission is a valid aid to safety. Notice that hunters or other hunters are present. Old wells, abandoned farm equipment and other hazards may be present etc.
Yes it is time it is unfortunate that it has to be like this but so many people are disrespecting land and farms property that there should be NO access unless asked...it is just common sense and a respectful	All be treated the same	I feel RM offices should have all landowners information and be able to provide contact if needed.	I think even "activities" need to be asked for permission. Over the years respect has been lost and there is not reason the farmer should have to pay the penatly or have land chewed up by activities....
Yes	All land the same	Written or verbal.... rm to provide email or text (cell) so there is a paper trail	No... everyone knows when hunting season is and where they intend to atv or snowmobile... obtaining permission is very easy
yes no one should be allowed on my land , AND YES IT IS AN OFFENCE	written permission should be needed prior to going on any landowners land	Written permission from landowner , that info can be supplied at RM office	YES ATV and snowmobilers need permission also
Yes!	ALL land being used for agricultural purposes SHOULD be treated the same.		

Yes, i believe it should require permission for posted and cultivated lands. Your introduction nails why danger of bio security and damages. For lands near highways/roads, people use field approaches as parking lots and block access. Land owners should be able to tow as would a business in town/cities. Damage from vehicles leaving the highway should have to be paid by the occupant of the vehicle (ie. if a semi losses control while on the highway and crosses past the ditch into a field, they should pay to fix the field/fence/crop loss)	not all land should be treated the same, it needs to be posted/fenced/cropped to have the protection	R.M.s should have a list of all land owners and contact information. Posted land should also have a phone number contact	no
No			
Yes	Treated the same	From landowner	No
No if it is not posted, people should be able to access it. The current system works well	It should all be the same	Phone or email would be best to prevent people from snooping through peoples yards/ coming directly to their house	Not really unreasonable, but more time consuming and potentially unnecessary. Posting the land allows people to either move on or ask permission if they really want to use that land. By requiring permission, most people probably will not do so and will continue to use unposted land
yes	all land that is privately owned or occupied by a renter should not be entered by any body for any reason with out permission granted	permission should be granted only when the land owner or if it is rented has agreed verbally to the person seeking permission	no
Yes, however there still needs to be right of access to Weed Inspectors, Pest Control Officers, etc. But for the general public, yes, prior permission for access should be required and this should be enforced.	It should all be treated the same.	Permissions should be sought either verbally (physical site visit to homestead via municipal roads and main entrances; telephone; or other face to face meeting) or written (mail; email; text message)	In the case of a groomed snowmobile or ATV trail maintained by a snowmobile or ATV club, I would feel that the permission granted to the club to mark, maintain and use that trail would also indicate that club members would be allowed to use the trail without having to contact the land owner. The existence of the formal trail indicates that a form of access approval has been granted by the land owner. If there is no groomed/maintained/marked trail, the recreational user should be contacting the land owner for permission prior to access.
Yes. Too much is at stake for agricultural land owners. Permission should first be given prior to going on to land.			
I think snowmobiling should be exempt from requiring prior permission if the land is not posted. Snowmobiles do little, if any damage to the land as they ride on "snow cover" on top of the ground. Plus the snowmobiles weight is spread over a large area, unlike a vehicle with tires.	I think it should be the land owners responsibility to "post" their land if they want to restrict access. The land owner also can now restrict specific activities, to protect their property. A fence in Saskatchewan should only mean their may be livestock present.	Permission should sought after only if posted signs "request" permission for certain activities. Contact info should be provided on the posted sign, so you can easily ask for permission. However, if you are crossing land to get to the closest house without the home owners permission, you are trespassing. With most people have cell phones there is no reason not to call first.	I believe "requiring permission prior to access" will negatively affect all recreational activities. However, I understand some activities can pose a risk to cause land damage .This was the reason for the separate "wildlife act", "ATV act" and "snowmobile act". As each activity poses a different risk. Snowmobiling has very little risk for land damage because of the vehicle type and winter season, I don't see a valid reason to restrict the access of this recreational activity. Plus, all Saskatchewan residents should be treated equally in respect to trespassing. If "posted" or "permission prior to access" is required to protect the land, then all residents should be obligated to obey.
Yes	Yes	Before entering on any land permission should be granted by a phone call ( with written permission) to the landowner or renter or email	No
No keep it the way it is	All land should be the same	By the land owner in writing	Yes if the land is not posted no trespassing it should be able to be used in the fall for hunters and winter by snowmobiles
No, if you don't want people on your land, post it	Same	Up to date easy to access information for landowners is a must	Seems as though it would be far less hassle for a land owner to post his/her land rather than dealing with countless requests from the public
Yes	All the same	An individual should first seek permission for access from owner or occupant.	No
Yes	All land treated equally	Hard copy. Written or digital permissions	Possibly. However ATV abuse is the most rampant

Yes	No, for clarity reasons, it should be the same. Permission should be attained from the landowner irregardless of what assumed or actual use of the land is.	Initially phone or email. Landowner has the right to request a face to face meeting. Landowner should also clarify where specifically access begins and ends (I.e permission to go on stubble field, but the neighbours winter wheat crop begins here so should be avoided)	No. If you choose to make rural areas your recreational playground, that is by all means fine. But you should have to buy and pay taxes on that land the same as people using land for agriculture or other business purposes. Or, ask permission.
The government should not require it but I believe it is the best practice. I worry all this would result in is landowners charging money for access. Big can of worms.	All land should be treated the same.	Phone call is fine. Often landowners get frustrated having to fill out paper work.	Yes
I do not agree gaining permission puts more people at the doorstep of the home owner if the land is posted it should be respected	No		Yes it would when land is posted it's respected if the land owner has any reason to not have others on their land they can post it signs are free
Yes	Yes	Call or talk to land owner	No
no	different		
Definitely NO ,, The landowner will restrict access by signage if he feels it is required. As a landowner I would not want to be answering calls at all hours of the day and night from people who only wish to walk out in my field to hunt a prairie chicken. I am very busy with harvest and livestock.	Just show respect for the landowner and he will not be posting his land. There is no need for trespass legislation changes. Most hunters, photographers, hikers etc. are very appreciative of the privledge of access.	Permission should only be sought when the landowner requests it.	Yes it would. Many hunters would simply give up the sport they love. It is unreasonable to make consent a prerequisite. The dollars that they spend and the money they raise for habitat and wildlife projects will be gone forever. And worst of all it would become almost impossible to introduce the next generation to the outdoors.
Yes.	Yes, all land should be treated the same. I don't know why you would want to complicate it with different land distinctions.	Is land ownership information public and can be obtained by contacting the RM office? I think if someone wants permission they should have to contact the landowner by phone, text, email.... after obtaining the information from the RM office	It probably would impede their activities but just because an individual engages in these recreational activities should they be allowed access to anyone's property? I don't think so.
No	Same	Easiest access point.	Yes
We fully believe that owners property rights should be written into SK law. No one should enter any private land without the owners permission.	All land should be treated the same and no one should trespass	If Property Rights were written into Sk law all residents would be protected. RM's have contact numbers and if permission to hunt or trespass is requires the person should get the information from the RM.	No. There are plenty of areas for recreation without trespassing on private property.
Yes.	All Agricultural land should be treated the same	Better markings on the road should be made so that when seeking permission, the quarter should be posted with the legal address of the owner at field access points only. Example: Owner lives at mile (or KM) _ on township road 2*** from range road ***	It will never stop those who don't listen in the first place, much the same way that robbers rarely will obey a locked door. However, perhaps a system of paint on a post at all entrances to indicate no hunting or trespassing may be easier and harder to remove from the post then a sign. Would be also easier with that system to maintain, as when a farmer enters a field, if they notice fading, they just repaint.
Yes	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.		
All parties looking to access private lands should require permission first, no exceptions.	All land should be treated the same.	Find the land owner or tenant and ask permission, if unsure look around and talk to the local neighbors to find out.	I don't believe so, you have no business on anyone's land without their permission.
YES	All land should be treated the same. In addition any undeveloped road allowances should also be included because they could provide a path for the introduction of weeds etc. onto adjacent lands.	Having a simple standardized form which could be validated by the person who manages the property and could be provided in person or by email/fax in advance. Don't add extra work to R.M. staff by having to constantly update emails phone numbers etc.	It is not unreasonable due to the adverse effects which the landholder is subjected to by uncontrolled access and the costs which could result from unknown persons.
If posted yes, if not posted no with the exception of hunting. Hunting should require prior express permission regardless if posted or not.	Treated the same	Via email, text or phone	Yes

Yes. It should not be up to the owner to ensure people are not on their land. People are not allowed to enter a urban property, why would a rural property be any different.	All should be the same. There are many reasons why the public should ask no matter the tyoe of property. Hazards or distruction (this can be accidental) can be caused by individuals accessing a piece of land with permission. The land owner is the only one that can clarify whats on their quarters.	An app would work the easiest. Requesting permission electronically allows for reduced confusion. Each land owner and person requesting permission would have a profile. Each person can recieve reviews, providing a rating or score.	No i think that this is easy enough to achieve. Most land owners are willing to say yes but just want to know who is on the property. An RM map is a great resource and usually available online
Yes	All the same	In person or on the phone with information on vehicle, numbers of individuals and specific time frames on and off property.	Not at all. One should always have permission when accessing any property any where.
No	Yes		Yes
this legislation would almost destroy the hunting community. With corporations owning large portions of land it is very difficult for hunters to locate the actual owner to get permission.	NO Land is land. If they are worried about the spread of infections etc they should post it. If this law comes into effect there should be no compensation for wildlife damage to crops etc.	RM maps are almost useless as a lot of it is owned by out of area residents large corporations and it is very difficult to contact the owner.	Yes
No The land owner has the right to post their land for no trespassing. This would kill the hunting community.	No	It is very hard to actually locate the land owner as RM maps are difficult to obtain as well there are large portions of land owned by corpoartions	It will cripple the hunting industry. Land owners that do not allow access should be denied insurance or other forms of compensation for wildlife damage.
Yes	There should be a distinction	In person over the phone or written	Yes
Yes	Same	Email,text or phone	No
Yes	Yes a distinction	In person over the phone or written	Yes
Yes. Possibly with the exception of snowmobile access where disease transfer is unlikely	Same	Verbal by personal or telephone.	Hunting mandatory permission is long overdue.
Yes	No	From landowner	No
Yes	All the same.	Sought.	Yes
yes	yes	through municipal offices	no
Yes, it should require written permission regardless of the activity.	All land should be treated the same.	Landowner/ occupant contact information can easily be obtained within the area, municipal offices, neighbors, local businesses and electronic means. Permission should obtained either written or electronic and must be produced by the person when requested local individuals (neighbors or local officials) or law enforcement.	No, it is not an unreasonable impediment, it's common (or not so common) sense or courtesy.
Absolutely !	Should be treated the same	Not sure	
Yes	No	Written	No
Yes, all members of the public should need to gain permission to enter any property, regardless of use of property.	All land should be treated the same. No confusion, no excuses that trespasser didn't know, majority of general public don't know the diffence between pasture and cultivated land (with snow cover)	An app on a smart phone could probably be developed with a way to gain permission. If not, Written permission with land owner phone # so they can be contacted when trespasser is caught.	No
No		None	Yes
yes	yes	verbal and written	
No. Why can't the various laws for access by brought together into a single piece of legislation.	Perhaps there should be differing treatment but this would be confusing.	What if there is no yard on the land you want to access and you don't know the owner or how to. Intact owner.	More often than not it would be very difficult and unreasonable.
yes	all treated the same	verbally asking the landowner, landowner should be seeded out by road access only	not unreasonable
Yes	Yes	Seek permission by attending at any on site inhabited residence by most direct route from a main access point.	No

Yes Saskatchewan needs to ad that to enter a landowners land permission is required. If the person entering a landowner's land does not have permission that person should pay a fine that increasrs with each offense.	All land should be treated the same, all land requiring permission before entry.	Persons wanting to go on our land need to find out who the owner is which could be a bit of a task. They may have to contact the RM office but still may not get a contact phone number because of the privacy act. When they are able to contact the owner written permission would be the best way to go. Or an email from the owner giving them permission.	No because some of the recreational people are excellent and respect the property of others and will have no issues with seeking permission. The problem is that there is a small percentage that think they can do and go wherever they want they have no respect for private or public property.
Yes	All land treated the same	Verbal or written	No
Absolutely YES	All privately owned agricultural land should be treated the same. Permission first!	Permission should be granted by the landowner or their agent. In person, telecommunication or e-mail are all acceptable. Local municipalites could be a great source of contact info, especially for hunters.	Difficult to speak for other land owners but I do not think it is an unreasonable impediment to contact landowners prior to access. Snowmobilers are the most difficult issue. Many now restrict themselves to club trails. The trails are great because prior consent has already been granted by landowners. Stay on the trail and everyone is happy. In winter there can be many unseen obstacles that are a danger to snowmobilers. I worry that their random travel could lead to injury and/or destruction of my property. Atv-ers and hunters should always have permission before entering private land.
	All privet land be it cultivated or pasture, should be treated the same.	You fined the owner of the land you wish to enter, and with a letter for permission, signed by you and the land owner.	require permission prior to access
Yes	All the same	Verbal permission would be okay, directly or by phone	Private property is private property, be it farm land or city backyard. An ATVer or anyone else should need permission to access either property
		Written permission signed by both parties	I don't think it is unreasonable for the public to have to have permission for any access to private property being it by foot or with an atv etc
NO. PRETTY HARD TO MANAGE HERD NUMBERS IF EVERYTHING IS HUNTING WITH PERMISSION ONLY. LAND OWNERS CAN POST LAND IF THEY DONT WANT HUNTING	YES. LAND WITH LIVESTOCK IS HUNTING WITH PERMISSION ONLY AND SHOULD STAY THAT WAY.	SHOULDN/T NEED PERMISSION ON UN POSTED LAND. AND SHOULD NEED WRITTEN PERMISSION ON POSTED AND LIVESTOCK LANDS. EX: I GOT VERBAL PERMISSION ON A POSTED PEICE. IVE BEEN HUNTING THAT LAND. SINCE IVE GOTTEN PERMISSION THE LAND WAS SOLD, I WAS UNAWARE OF THE SALE (NONE OF MY BUISNESS). NOW WHAT, I HAD NO WAY OF KNOWING OTHER THAN FINDING OUT FROM HEAR SAY/ COFFEE SHOP TALK.	??
No	Treated the same	Enhanced access to municipal maps with contact information	Yes very unreasonable. Should remain the same, only if land is posted no trespassing.
Yes	It should all be treated the same	In person or by phone	No as a land owner it is my right to control who is entering or property
Only if the whining farmers and SARM who want to restrict access to hunters receive no compensation from taxpayers for wildlife damage to crops.	I feel that this wording is so vague that this could be argued to prohibit access to all land other than provincial forests. I would support this prohibition for a farmers home quarter.	implied consent unless posted otherwise.	Clearly it would.
yes	yes	yes	no

No , how are you going to enforce that , you will have the occupiers of that particular piece of land telling lies so that they can kill people and get away with murder	Yes	You can not walk up to the occupiers of the land and ask you get murdered so you will need to educated all saskatchewan people that takes money. You will need to put up billboards to remind them and educated the land occupiers as well on what is acceptable and how to deal with the situations. This will take years and lots of money . You will need to work with a Indigenous communities and have then educated as well. This isn't a one way street for non Indigenous people and free get out of jail killing spree for someone who happens to be on their rented lands. After all , these are Indigenous lands and you are the renters	I think there should be a law if the trespassers consistently go on their lands but if it's a one time issue then it can be discussed between the land renters and the trespassers. Land renters must document before any action is taken .
yes	All land being used to agriculture should be treated the same	Either direct permission at homestead or by contacting RM for contact number	No
yes...they can be spreading club root and other diseases which will diwn grade the value of the land!! also move weeds around the provance	NO. all privet land should be classed the same	verbal only so a person will know who...where ....when....and why they need to be on your land	no....if they spread disease to my land who will pay for this?.....loss of value could be 100,000....or more who knows!!
No. Being a land owner if I do not want people on my land I will have it posted. I do not post my land.	All property should be treated the same as it is private property. If you want people off you should be responsible to post it yourself.	If it is made to where you must obtain permission for everywhere you will drive a lot of land owners crazy with all the phone calls and inquiries	Huge impact! As of now if landowners do not want hunting, there land is posted. Snowmobiling is huge in our area and this would be detrimental to businesses and also the snowmobilers , which I am one of
Yes	Yes	Through direct contact	No
YES ACCESS SHOULD NOT BE ENTERED UNTIL PERMISSION IS RECEIVED FROM THE PROPERTY OWNER	All land should be treated the same	verbal agreement for anybody to be on the land	no one has the right to be on private property without consent including First Nations people or Metis WE are all of the same right as we are all Canadians
Access by vehicle only should require express permission.	As per previous recommendation, for vehicles use only.	This is going to be extremely difficult. Some landowners and/or lessees do not have a listed telephone number. Some landowners defer to permission to access to the lessees.	Yes for hunters and fishermnen. No for snowmobilers and/or atvers. All if not most activities are the result of abuse caused by vehicles. Not individuals on foot. It can be extremely difficult at times to obtain permission from landowners for the purpose of hunting and fishing. Landowners often defer to the lessee for permission. Farmers harvesting crops are working long hours and are hard to contact during harvest season. Often telephone numbers are not listed. Or the lessee or owner is from another province. Oftentimes it is not common knowledge as to who owns the property. Some landowners will be inundated with hunters wanting access at a time where they are most busy. I have experienced personal frustrations with obtaining access to land for the purpose of hunting. Some individuals restrict access across their land so that people cannot have access to public lands. In effect, restricting public land access to themselves. Look at the sale of wildlife land to a private individual South of Marean Lake at the SW corner of Greenwater Provincial Park as an example. There is a road allowance on the South side of the Park, however the cleared trail veers onto, what is now private land. This use to be Fish and Wildlife Development Fund land. It was given to a private individual and now he restricts all access to that area. He has his own private hunting preserve. Basically removing all hunting competition because of access. This basically comes down to the sale of a public resource, wildlife, to a private individual.
Yes	All land treated the same	A personal visit or a phone call with the person name and contact info left so the owner or renter nose who is out there	To all activities. Then if there is an accident the land owner or renter is not liable for any damage or occurred cost to the personnel on the land
Yes.	To avoid confusion about usage of the land it is my opinion that all land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same.	By attending at any on site inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point. Those seeking permission must attend in person.	No.

yes	All treated the same. They are private property and should need express permission.	Access through municipal offices would address these concerns. Direct contact can also bring with it intimidation and threats by armed hunters (and this happens).	No, it is private property.
yes.	all land should be treated the same	Both scenarios described above are reasonable and should be considered.	It may be, but I think landowner rights come before someone else's recreation.
Yes, written permission for anyone to enter private property and farmland. And written permission required for EACH member of a group .	No, All privately owned land should require written permission before entry for any reason by any person or company/agency.	Yes persons seeking access should have to locate landowners and obtain written permission for the specific land they wish to enter.	No it would not be an UNREASONABLE impediment to recreational activities!!! I know if I was to ride an ATV/snowmobile across peoples lawn/yards in a city or town I would be in jail and charged with multiple offences!!!
No. Keep it as is. With numbered companies and estates owned property gaining information to contact landowners and leases is extremely complicated. Trying to gain information to gain access is almost impossible. With more people using cell phones locating owners is almost impossible. Status Quo is the way to go. Enforcement RCMP in rural area are already stretched thin and dealing with petty trespassing claims will flood their operations. Conservation officers won't be able to enforce hunting on posted land after the fact since its a trespass issue not a hunting issue. Snowmobiling and ATving is extremely difficult to enforce after the fact. Bio-security How many times have you gone down the highway or gravel road and seen the clumps of dirt from farmers equipment littering the roadway. If the farmers are doing nothing to control earth born diseases then why are you putting huge restrictions/blame on ATV's and hunters. Wildlife Compensation if the new trespass act is changed to make hunting more strict on lands then all wildlife compensation to farmers needs to be taken away. If the general public is unable to harvest animals then the farmers should not be able to claim wildlife damage. The farmer wants to control/restrict who is on their land then they will have to deal with the wildlife damage that comes with restricted hunting activity Public access With the government selling off WHPA land, sask ag and food land, and other public land within the past couple of year the amount of public use land has been extremely reduced. If this trespass act is changed all leased crown land (WHPA/sask ag food land) should not be able to be posted and access should be granted to all person, once harvest is complete on them. This is crown land with the lease being able to use it for agricultural purposes. Once the crop is off then the agricultural use is complete and the public should have access to this land for recreational purposes.	No they should not be treated the same. If farmers want to keep people off their land then they should fence it and post it. People do it all the time in towns and cities. If they want to protect their property from people then they could spend the money and fence off their land. Why are we trying to be the same as Alberta? What we have in Saskatchewan is good already. Why try to fix something that is not broken?	If you want to go this route than permission should be given in writing only. Permission needs to be carried at all time. Easy to enforce that way. Permission needs to be gained yearly and needs to be signed by other the occupier and land owner/lease. Permission can not be granted for longer than one year. If permission is granted for one activity it is granted for all activities on the land. ex: permission given for snowmobiling also grants permission for atv and hunting	Yes it will restrict most if not all recreational activities negatively Hunting - hunting numbers will drop drastically. The draw hunters will drop off because gaining permission in zones further from the cities is almost impossible. Young generations will not get into hunting because trying to get permission will be near impossible to get. Little to no public land available for hunting. With less hunters harvesting animals the amount of wildlife damage claims will increase. If this trespass act is changed then wildlife compensation for farmers should be removed. ATV - change of permission will not change activities. Seems these individuals do not care about posting or the damage they do to the land they ride on. Only way to keep these individuals off the land is to fence the land. Snowmobiling - do not seem to do as much damage to the fields as ATVs. Most individuals obey the posting signs. Best way to keep them off the land is to fence the land. Other recreationalists - bird watchers, berry pickers, hikers and others will be affected negatively
No this is not right.		If the land is posted by the land owner stating hunting or access with permission only then get permission from that land owner. If land is not posted then it's ok to be on.	Yes it would be horrible for recreational activities. I live in the northern part of the province where we strive on hunting, fishing, snowmobiling. We rely on tourism this would definitely affect tourism and possibly ruin it.
I think home quarters should require permission, but fields and forest areas if not posted appropriately should be accessible to sledders, quadders and hunters.	If surrounded by a fence it should be a given to stay out. Cultivated land should have signs posted if farmer wants people to stay off.	Drive down the driveway during the day light	Unreasonable, unless it is a home quarter or posted you should be able to ride there
Yes. At the very LEAST we should not be held responsible if someone is injured on private property that they had no permission to be on. There are many unseen dangers on private property, drainage ditches, back flood irrigation ground culverts, rock piles, smaller machinery which could be partially covered by snow and you wouldn't see until it is too late.	All land should be treated the same - NO TRESPASSING. In 2018 it is unreasonable to expect farmers to POST cultivated land. That worked when you had a few hundred acres but not today.	I would be strongly opposed to any public publishing of phone number or email. The only way I would want a phone call would be from someone I know asking permission. I think we need an app on phone where you have a map of area you would like to hunt or snowmobile. As a farmer I could POST my quarters with no trespassing. If my neighbour is happy with hunters they wouldn't post their land. If we had an app, laws could be similar to today but much more realistic for posting. Without an app I think the only way people would be on my land is if they know me & my phone number.	No I don't think it is an unreasonable impediment; but I think MORE important is your statement "there is no legal entitlement to access private property". If I can't go to the city and use your backyard, I don't understand the sense of entitlement that you can access my property.
Yes	They all should be the same	Buy a RM map and find out who owns the land and go to their house or call to arrange a time/place to meet	No I don't think it would. If thier activity is important to them, they will take the time to get permission first.

Yes	All the same	Municipal offices upgrade owner database to include cell phone numbers with some privacy legislation granting permission to give these out	No
No . Access to rural land without express permission should be available for foot traffic only. Anyone wishing to take a vehicle on rural property should have express permission.	Land that is under cultivation or has livestock on it should be treated with a higher level of diligence	Posting of e-mail addresses and/or phone numbers as well as up to date RM maps on line with contact info would help regardless of any changes to the law.	I am an upland bird hunter . Such a change would stop me from pursuing birds I see in a field or entering the field from a ditch . It might also stop me from pursuing wounded game in some circumstances.
Yes	All agricultural land should be treated the same	Permission should be granted by the land owner With a little forthought hunters should be able to contact the RM office with a list of land they wish to hunt on In the interest of privacy the Administrator could then contact the effected land owner	Not at all People I know travel to other provinces to sled. They obtain written permission before starting their outing I think it is reasonable for people to receive local permission as well
Yes	all should be treated the same	Talk to the land owners or renters for permission. The R.M. offices would be a logical place to get access to the name of the land owner. The owner when contacted can advise if the land is rented and provide contact information	It would be an impediment but we don't feel it is unreasonable. As land holders we often see improper use of land whether it's atv's operated in seeded land or cutting ruts in the mud or dumping!!!
yes!	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. These lands produce the famers' livelihoods and should all be treated with equal respect.	Access should be sought through RM maps and municipal offices	
Yes	All should be the same	Posting emails and phone numbers would seem to be a quick measure except for areas of poor coverage. Otherwise yes, asking landowners first	No. If it is my land that I have to manage and pay for then I do not want people on it unless I know who they are and have offered consent. I earn an income from my land. I do not want clubroot spread onto my land, nor weed seeds. I do not want their garbage. I do not want them tracking across.
Yes	All land being used for Agricultural purposes be treated the same.	Posting telephone number of owner	It is not unreasonable to make it a requirement for consent in all circumstances.
Yes	There should be a difference. Homeland or fenced property should be better protected than agricultural land		No consent should be sought prior to activities
Yes!	All should be treated the same.	Speaking to the landowner in person should be required. Written permission needs to be granted.	No.
Yes permission should be requested by the public	All agricultural land should be treated the same whether is cultivated or grazed	written permission	No. Permission should be granted from the land owner before anyone enters their property for any kind of activity wheather recreational or not
Yes!	ALL land being used for agricultural purposes SHOULD be treated the same.	Permission for access is a tough one - with todays technology sending an email or a text is quick and simple if the contact info is available and provides proof in writing for both parties. The issue will be to always have CURRENT/CORRECT contact info available. As an administrator I would have no problem having info at office ONLY if it isn't a confidentiality breach on privacy.	No, it should not represent an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities as the land does not belong to them period - regardless of recreation activities - respect for each other AND each others belongings - whether that be land, vehicles, recreation machines etc. Even if permission is granted respect of boundaries MUST still be abided by!
Yes when you have doors broken down and fill indeep ruts from a foreign vechile to your land and no one is accountable we have a problem! We have had hunters drive along a fence and the bumper would spin the fence post break the wires and no one is accountable! [REDACTED]	Yes	Any hunter would and should know what and who's area of land they are on there fore would be able to seek permission.	No

No	If we are going to have need permission, it should be only for land that is fenced. It would be far too easy to miss a no trespassing sign.	That's why this plan would never work. Farmers aren't going to want every Tom, Dick and Harry driving into their yard to ask for permission and they also aren't going to want their phone number posted on the internet.	Absolutely. It would completely ruin the sport of snowmobiling. It would take months to get a hold of all these people, and one you did get a hold of them who is to say they are going to respond? And if they do respond and deny you access are you supposed to start all over again asking people along a different route? And if you ever did get a route planned you are basically stuck to that route. It's a horrible idea
Yes	Yes	Directly from the land owners They should know who land it is or have a R M map	No
No, For activities such as snowmobiling it would be virtually impossible to obtain permission for all owners to use there property. Where land is posted and easily identify then permission should be required.	It should all be treated the same.	Where land is posted it should be up to the one posting the land to include contact information regarding accessing the land. If there is a requirement to you must have permission to use it and a person can not find it you will severely limit the recreation activities in the province. People will either stop their activities or over time will not bother to do anything which will lead to many more disputes in the field and a potential to overburden the justice system as we all know there are not enough law enforcement officers available in the rural parts already to manage real crimes never mind access crimes.	I believe it would. Many recreational activities can cover over 50 miles a day in all directions. Having to get consent will severely limit these activities and people will either stop going altogether or just completely ignore it.
This can only happen if the contact information for the rural land owner is properly publicized and/or made public. I don't know what method would be required to 'secure that consent' would imply? Would I need written consent, a text, verbal agreement??? Does it make a difference for what purpose one is requesting access?	privately owned land is owned. I don't see how one can distinguish if land is under cultivation. Fences and natural boundaries are confusing...not sure how someone can tell if the border is intended to keep animals in or people out. If the property is surrounded by an old, dilapidated fence that would not keep animals in or that a person could step over is that considered a fence or boundary.	For property occupied I am fine with the requirement of direct route, although I have been in situations where I have come into individual's yards from other means (e.g., following an old trail that comes into the back of a yard). However, the majority of the private rural land is not occupied by individuals. How do I contact the owner of property that does not live on the land I am wanting to access? RM maps are outdated before they leave the print shop. Land owner information would need to be made available live through ISC. Then there is the issue of the land owner and a leasee(s)--who controls access to the land or does this depend on the contract between the land owner and the lease and if this later contract determines then how is an individual supposed to be able to contact the person controlling access to the land?	in cases where there is no detriment to the private land I see little reason to limit access. I own rural land and if a snowmobiler goes across the land there is little reason for concern. If a hunter shoots an game animal I don't have a big concern as long as they do so in a safe manner and do not rut up the property either during the hunt or the retrieval process. Similar considerations for bird watchers or anyone watching game or picking berries. ATVs can be an issue if they rut the field or carry weeds or diseases from other properties. This process appears to be coming from justice. I don't know how this process can proceed without involving SERM or directly soliciting input from the hunting community. Rural farmland moose is and to a lesser extent deer populations are a major concern. Moose hunting in particular will be severely impacted by the suggested anti-trespass changes. Landowner and hunter relations should be improved, but forcing consent is only going to increase the barrier for law abiding citizens. People that disregard the law now are not going to change their activity due to amendments to the Trespass law. I see a growing trend of younger farmers just not wanting anyone to enter their property--this is going to further exacerbate problems between hunters, eco-tourism, berry pickers, etc. The younger farms may have legitimate reasons for keeping people off their land--disease, rutting/damage, or general liability. But, they have a method now to address these concerns and that is to post their land. I like to speak to land owners before accessing their land, but this isn't always possible. There is another issue that needs to be addressed and that is of game animal/bird damage to farmer's rural property--the farmer should not get insurance or compensation for animal/bird damage if they can not prove that they have let hunters onto their property. Knowing who to contact is a big concern for the people attempting to get access--this information should be publicly available--free--on ISC website and through Habi-Sask. If there are problems with specific groups accessing private rural land then address
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	A person that want to gain access, could go to the RM office and find out who the land owner is. It should be up to the person wanting to gain access to get permission.	Yes, consent should be given for any activity.

Yes, with conditions.	No, as long as there is adequate and reasonable information available to acquire permission to enter the land and be aware of any restrictions that may apply. Eg, walk only Another option would be to consider the state of Montana's rule, whereby the yardsite, or location that the owner doesn't want anybody on is marked by coloured posts, anything outside of that is accessible. This would enable the landowner to allow people access without bothering them.	By a sign at access points, by the contact information being made available on RM maps. The sign would indicate the best method to seek permission, either by phone or directions to meet with the landowner personally, as some landowners want to know explicitly who is on their land. Unfortunately I can see this is going to cause problems, as landowners do not like to be bothered by requests for permission, so they will be required to post signs, which as I saw on the news was the big concern for the trespass act review. And for the landowner that doesn't mind people going on his land to access the wildlife that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, well, now he has to post his land which may well be something he was trying to avoid.	Personally, I'm of the opinion that a change requiring express permission may well have enough of an impact that a very large number of hunters will simply quit hunting. This could well represent enough of a drop in revenue that the current government would seek alternative means to regenerate that revenue, and allow paid access, and allow foreign hunters into the southern parts of Saskatchewan. Of course there would be some opposition to this harvest of our wildlife while we can't access it ourselves but chances are it would be so severely diminished as to be disregarded. Again, unfortunately I think the main motive behind this review, to eliminate the resident hunter in favour of guiding and paid access. Keep in mind, the wildlife in this province is vested in the province and that means every person living here and the government should do everything in their power to ensure continued access to this resource. To that end, crown land is also a publicly owned resource and there maybe a push to allow access to those lands should private land no longer be available without cost. Then again, I expect the government has already taken that into consideration and may be considering rewriting the contracts to allow guiding and other activities on crown leased land.
No they should not. As a hunter, if the land is not posted the farmer or landowner should have to put up a sign unless it is standing crop of course, or close to a yard, or if livestock are in pasture. If the property owner is that set they don't want hunting they should have to take the time to put signs up. Producers complain and request insurance proceeds for damaged feed due to wildlife however they won't permit hunting. This should not be allowed.	No there should be differences. Pasture land is for the most part not used in winter months as livestock are fed in yards. The fenced pastures should be open for use unless posted and the land owners should need to post contact information so potential hunters can get in touch with them.	It should be open for access unless posted and if posted landowners contact information should be at access point.	Yes in most cases. Many corporations own land now and there is no way to know who owns the property without doing corporate searches.
No. This would kill sport and recreation in the province, the tourism industry, as well as sport and recreation businesses.	There should be distinctions.	It shouldn't be sought at all unless they have a sign or unless it is within a certain distance from a homestead.	Yes. 100% impediment for recreation activities. It would kill all recreational activities in Saskatchewan, the tourism industry, and businesses related.
yes	yes, all land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. Some people leave gates open on pasture land. Who is responsible if someone hits a cow on the road and is injured or killed?	I don't know of any land owner who would object to someone driving into the yard to ask permission provided you are on the driveway and not driving across a field. Also maybe land owners who don't want anyone hunting on their land could have that information at the RM offices, or leave your cell number with RM secretary, who could text request on behalf of hunters. not sure if that would work. It could also be up to the individual land owner to leave access information at the RM office.	I don't think so, people who don't mind having recreational activities could make that known through clubs, RMs, etc.
No I do not believe this should happen. This could become a issue for land owners that have pest control issues. Not all skunks etc stand around for use to gain permission to dispatch them.	No I do not believe there should be a distinction all land should be open access posted or not you will not keep law breakers off	All Land owners should have to give up contact info to the rm so that we as hunters can contact them	Yes
no	all land being used for agricultural purposed should be treated the same.	individuals seeking access should use established roads to access and seek permission from the property owner.	Yes as many landowners own property that is vastly spread over many kilometers making it difficult to locate the landowner; it would also make it unreasonable for emergency related access needs.
YES	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	1. Person wanting permission should phone. 2. If permission to be given, then a meeting set up. A liability waiver would be signed. This would include vehicle description, license plate, and names of all person/s.	No. Just because it's recreational does not mean they do not have to ask permission. They can plan ahead. Why should they should be excused and not held accountable.
		Require accessing the residence via the most direct route, but enable landowners to post alternative instructions if they wish	
Yes	No difference	Written	No it's a privilage to have any access

Yes	Same	Ask	
Yes			
Yes	All land shall be treated the same	Main access point	No
No, I think the existing legislation is sufficient. It can be problematic getting permission before stepping on another person's land and it gives landowners an overly inflated sense of self righteousness that can exacerbate conflict.	All land should be treated the same.	And this is where it is problematic. It doesn't make much sense to post an email address that might not be monitored all that well. What happens if there are mistakes or misunderstandings?	Yes it would.
Yes	Treated the same.	By personal contact, via in person or talk on phone!	No, consent is needed no matter the activity!
Yes	No distinction	Written permission	No
Yes	All agricultural land should be treated the same. We have had gates left open and livestock escaped, neighbours have had livestock injured. Just because you can't see livestock when you enter a pasture doesn't mean they aren't there. We give permission to many hunters on our land, but only in areas where there aren't livestock and aren't already hunters on that land. Permission needs to be a necessity on all lands to ensure the safety of not only livestock, but also humans enjoying the land.	Permission should be sought by the most direct route to a residence and should be written permission.	No. We have many people who are able to take the time to ask for permission. It's not difficult and most land owners appreciate the courtesy and time taken to ask and will gladly give permission.
Yes	All land should be treated the same when used for agricultural purposes .	Enhanced access to land owners through municipal offices.	No.
Yes!!!	No. Private property is private property.	Contact by phone. If permission granted, meet in person. Liability Indemnity signed to grant permission. Names & addresses of all person being granted permission plus vehicle description and license plate of all vehicles.	No. If they want to go on the land the least they can do is obtain permission. Land owners know of hazardous areas (embankments, pits, rock piles, etc.). Farmers have crops in the fields and ranchers have fences; neither are given any consideration by some recreationalists.
No. With the size of farms these days, finding a landowner is often impractical if not impossible these days. Many farms are owned by people living many miles further making accessing permission difficult in many scenarios. Landowners ave the right to post their land preventing trespassing and this system is effective and reliable.	All land the same.	Posting phone numbers of email addresses around land would be helpful in the event that landowners who don't live near their property wanted to control who used their land and when.	Yes. Hunting would be nearly impossible in many areas given the fact that there are large tracts of unposted land with no farmyards within the vicinity. Posting land with signs no hnting or no trespassing works well. I don't think we should mix hunting with people coming onto people's property and stealing stuff. These are 2 completely different subsets of the population and I don't think that restricting hunting access will have any effect on property damage or theft by criminals.
Yes the public should need permission from the land owner or occupier to enter any property if it is cultivated, pasture or any other agricultural purpose. This is due to the damage that may happen, to the land, wether it is intentional or not as well as to help prevent the spread of disease. There should be no exceptions to this rule.	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be the same.	Permission should be sought by various means. They can ask at an RM office, get and RM map, talk directly with the land owner or occupier at his/her residence. It doesn't take much effort to find out who owns or occupies land. If they need or want to get out on the land bad enough they will find out who to talk to.	All should ask first. No exceptions! Hunter can build a reputation and relationship with land owners. ATV and snowmobiles should ask due to unfamiliarity to the land. Crop could still be out in swath in the winter, landscaping could have been done in the summer or trenches for laying water pipes not yet filled in. New electric fences could have erected and may not be highly visible during certain conditions. There are countless things that could injure someone on the land
YES	YES	By coming to the yardsite via municipal roads and receiving permission verbally from the owner or occupant of the land.	NO THIS IS NOT UNREASONABLE AS BIOSECURITY IS OF UTMOST IMPORTANCE, AND THE LAND IS PRIVATELY OWNED!

<p>No Consider the following: 1. Rural cemeteries which were never legally subdivided are the property of current landowners. Municipal governments should be encouraged to designate all cemeteries as Municipal Heritage Properties to facilitate public access. 2. Access to lands in case of emergencies - accidents, fire suppression, rescue 3. Use of road allowances, where there is no indication that the R.M. has abandoned it to adjacent landowners.</p>	<p>Distinctions should be made. Consideration of inherent risk of damage is a factor. One person on foot is much different than joy riders using four wheel drive trucks.</p>	<p>From landowner, in any format, if access is foreseeable. R.M. offices are cutting back on hours, limiting contact possibilities to determine landowner. Landowners may be absent for extended periods. Also, numbered companies are becoming more common, with uncertain 'owner' and identity of 'authorized representative' sometimes confidential or distant (also lease arrangements could be in place).</p>	<p>Yes Examples: Bird and mammal counts, where identification of species may prompt unforeseen access to uninhabited farmyard with trees. Low-impact access to creeks or rivers. Berry picking in remote areas, not utilized by owner.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All treated the same</p>	<p>Rm information or posted as oil co. Do at access points. Access granted by owner or appointed contact</p>	<p>If land owners are held responsible in anyway for anything on their land should they not control access to their land. This is farmers place of work no one should enter a work place without permission and guidance to stay safe.</p>
<p>Yes. All access by members of the public to rural property should require prior express permission of the rural landowner or occupier. Failure to secure that consent should constitute an offence.</p>	<p>All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Yes permission should be obtained directly from the landowner by using the most direct access possible to the residence. This must be done prior to any entrance onto the landowners property.</p>	<p>No this is very reasonable. The landowner is the steward of the land and will always have the best interest of that land in mind. This is of utmost importance for the sustainability of our agricultural lands.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same</p>	<p>It should be up to each person to find out who owns the land and then get permission from the owner in writing</p>	<p>No it wouldn't</p>
<p>Yes yes</p>	<p>Yes all should be treated the same</p>	<p>Written permission ask the land owner and obtain written consent that the person(s) attempting to access the land have the right to do so and that consent letter shall be kept on their person while accessing said land</p>	<p>No absolutely. but winter trails are different because the fields are not being utilized in the winter time. trails canada must handle consent and permissions to access and roam the land in question</p>
<p>No, I do not want to be overly troubled for written permission to hunt, hike, or otherwise constructively use my land when I have no reason to deny someone simple uses of my property. Absence of a "no trespassing" sign or such is implied consent for normal guest use.</p>	<p>Yes. Yard sites, property with animals, or property that is actively being used (e.g. market gardens, orchards, cropped land) should be treated differently. Again, this could be communicated via signage. Penalties for trespassing on such lands should be such that trespassers are dissuaded from trespassing.</p>	<p>Written permission either on paper or via text is likely best to avoid confusion. Verbal permission leaves opportunity for confusion or abuses both by the landowner and the guest. Signage confirming no permission is still a suitable form of communication.</p>	<p>No. As a cattle operator I do not want to legally require permission to go onto another person's land to secure and move my animals, nor would I want my neighbour to stall in getting his animals under control should they get loose onto my land. I think that hunters should also be given leeway to bring down wounded game. If any written express consent be required, it should be with respect to the degree of use of the land (e.g. driving a vehicle or quad, camping over night, picking berries, or...?).</p>
<p>Yes. All property not just farm land. No, I believe that this is over and above any action required. When hunting especially on certain land, I believe it is necessary that access to the land not be required to obtain permission prior to. Most cases it is very difficult for a person to find contact information for the land owner etc.</p>	<p>All land treated the same No, I believe certain land be accessed by foot only. Land that hold livestock should not be accessed or hunted for any reason unless permitted to do so by the land owner.</p>	<p>Written permission I believe there should be a system implemented to ensure ease in contacting land owner. As of right now it is incredibly difficult to find contact information. I personally do not like driving up to people houses to contact them.</p>	<p>No it is not unreasonable Yes.</p>
<p>No.... implementing this will allow land owners the opportunity to start charging for access to their land for the purposes of hunting. This will lead to only those with money the ability to hunt where the animals actually are. Public land hunting is already difficult due to other natural predators(wolves) and the adding hunter traffic will make the task even more difficult than it already is.</p>		<p>Tracking down farmers during hunting season can be extremely difficult. Most are likely to be out doing farming activities and have little time to talk with hunters.</p>	<p>Yes!!!! Farmers during hunting season are very busy and do not want to be talking with hunters. In addition., some farmers will charge for access to their land creating a pay for play system which is unfair</p>

No	Yes there should be a distinction because lots of fenced land is community pasture unsuitable for most other agriculture but suitable for snowmobiling in winter months and often adjacent to provincial forests where snowmobiling is allowed.	I do not agree with knocking on doors myself personally. If you plan ahead you could get this information at an RM office. Provided the landholder has chosen to register his land appropriately you could email or phone him leaving his personal residence location out of the picture. If he does not have his information registered in this APROPRIATE manor or if he does not respond to email or phone calls after a week he simply is doing nothing and doing nothing is the same as not being worried about some one asking permission to cross over his field with a snowmobile.	Well for those that do not plan ahead for there excursion but simply expect to unload there recreational toy anywhere and proceed in any direction they will get into trouble eventually. I think that generally most people are not concerned about some of these activities on their property until it starts to leave a foot print. Even then a lot of people may talk about it but do nothing. Just human nature tells us it will impact all these classes as mentioned in the question, I would say again make it reasonable for someone to get access to online? maps or make requests with a sask drivers license number etc at an RM office. There if the land owner has SPECIFICALLY registered the property you would like to cross to get to the forest or to get down to a river etc now you can reach out to the property owner by phone or preferably email. If the property owner does not respond in a week or does not have that particular parcel of land registered with his contact information then is clear that he is not concerned enough to respond to you and by doing nothing is allowing you access. I say particular parcel of land registered because the land owner maybe will only worry about registering his home quarter or one where he has livestock or beehives etc etc Also I believe in this method because just as a make work project RM offices may be encouraged to have all and every land owner register their land whether they want to or not as a make work project maybe call in all the relatives for overtime with this legislative win fall.
		A written agreement between the land owner and the party wishing to access the land. This agreement should be readily available to law enforcement upon request no different than hunting tags, licences, or other identification.	No this is not unreasonable. Private land is private land. Permission should be granted by the land owner only. This way there will hopefully be more accountability when the land owner experiences a financial loss because of the irresponsibility of the party accessing the land. Too many fences broken, gates left open, people driving through fields and tearing them up, and damage being done.
Yes.	All property should be treated the same.		The only exception would be snowmobiling on cultivated land providing there is no crop under snow( fall seeded crop or hay land )
yes	If the land is not yours- stay off	by phone. person's seeking permission to access privately owned land have not been invited into the owners yard.	snowmobilers need to be addressed differently, as they do not carry weapons, nor do they have immediate access to trails and can not drive on roads, yet need to be licenced? where as quads are equipped to carry guns and are on road but not licenced??
No	All should be left as the rule is now. If owners want no hunting they can post it.	Permission should be asked for posted land only	Yes because each quarter of land is only 1/2 mile by 1/2 mile a deer can leave that in minutes and your hunt would be over.
Yes	All treated the same	In person or by phone	No
I'm all for getting permission first before accessing land. But it would be a lot easier if the road signs had phone numbers or RM maps had phone numbers as well. More and more land is owned by corporations or #'d companies so trying to find who owns the land is increasing difficult. It's getting to the point that its too much hassle and I may be giving up hunting all together going forward	If all agri land is posted the same then permission is required everywhere. it makes it simple, but finding contacts for ownership is proving more difficult	Better access to owner contact info is required. The app iHunter allows access to RM maps for a fee with contact info. this is really handy. But not all RM's will allow this. Have all RM's post contact info and a lot of problems would go away	
	Yes	Written consent by the owner or renter of the land	Yes
No	Yes there should be a distinction. No they should not be treated the same.	If required should be multiple ways to obtain. However there needs to be better recording of land ownership and contact information. Very difficult to try and find out who owns and in different areas. Even more difficult when land ownership recorded as a numbered company.	Yes.
No a lot of lands it is impossible to get ahold of the land owner			

There needs to be harder punishment for people that disobey going on posted land. land that is not posted locating owners is very hard to do. There is alot of lease land and RM MAPS dont show if ownership has changed	That still can be very confusing alot of old farm in sask have 60year old fence up but it doesn't mean spandex C.	The current manor if they dont want hunting it gets posted and if they dont care have open. Farmers and land owner might get tired of a million people asking to hunt every year. And when your hunting on open prairies it very hard to find where land changes ownership	Yes.
No because it's getting so difficult to know who land owners are and to contact them rm maps dont list phone numbers and a lot of property is under a business name ie. Sask Ltd 1466432.	There should be a difference	Rm maps need to be updated and more accessible on the maps should be a contact email or phone numbers listed for all the properties. This day and age lots of people no longer have home phones and numbers are not in phone books	See last comment. Rm maps need to be updated if this change is going forward. It can be extremely difficult getting a hold of some landowners and everything should be accessible online. Ie. All rm maps posted online with contact numbers
I believe access should be restricted for those who use machinery (ATV's, Sleds, Vehicles) on agricultural land without permission since these can cause damage to the property. However, I do not believe this should apply to hunters who go on foot- it will most likely affect hunting province wide. Some permission is hard to get (old numbers, not enough information etc), if they absolutely don't want people on their land they post it, and lawful citizens do respect the signs.	They should be treated the same. Land with gates can still be respected, people only need to close gates and not damage fences. Allowing people to hunt in some spots allows money to go into other parts of the province (gas, hotels).	Permission is ideal, and I do ask when I find out who the owners are but it is not always possible and therefor I believe it should be left as is.	It would affect younger generations from starting to hunt (and they are in decline). Some farmers already don't want to give access. If they were to change to permission required then they need a new system where the homeowners information (more than RM maps) are more easily accessible- with names and numbers that are actually in service.
	Yes		Yes
No	Should be the various distinctions	Email address, cell and land line number	Yes
In one word: NO. If the land owner has no hunting/trespassing signs then yes go ahead with fines or whatever. If land is not posted keep rules the same.	Common courtesy and respect go a long way. Again post land if no access allowed, use common sense and dont drive on a field.....	If the land is posted they should leave some sort of contact info. If not posted then no permission needed. The problem is some will abuse their "new found power" and act as the over lord of all rural property. There are already people here in sask who act this way. I own city and rural property so I do have ground to stand on here!	Yes it would most definitely cause serious hardship for all sorts of outdoors enthusiasts. How would one get direct permission from the crown to hunt or ride atv on crown land? I will also add that I see there will be no permission needed for aboriginal or matis peoples. That is completely unfair and bias. One set of rules for all..... I know it is in the constitution, but that also should be changed. In this world of equality and a nation of all walks of life that seems like favoritism. Before you label me ignorant or a racist I will let you know my wife is matis there for as are my children. So in saying all that if you want to change any laws, make them one set of laws for EVERYBODY.
yes	all treated the same	inhabited land owner first, if not applicable then through municipa	all circumstances
Yes should have written consent to go on private land	All land should be tested the same	Contact landowners and get written permission	No get permission
Yes	All farm land should be treated the same.	Can get access through a phone call most rm offices have a direct contact or legal land description for the land owner. I think a phone call or asking in person are the best method.	Yes
Yes			
Yes	Same	By phone call or by on site visit. If you wanted to make changes, have the person posting the land leave a name and phone number on the posted sign similar to how you have to do that for an ice shack.	Most likely, but again the snowmobile association can manage this by asking farmers/ranchers in the areas of its ok, then posting/sharing RM maps of where you can and can't go.
Yes	All land that is privately owned should be treated the same.	Writing permission	No all activities take some prep work so getting consent would just be part of the activities.

No it should not	It should all be the same. People know already to not go in a field that still has a crop on it.	People should be talking to the owners	It is extremely unreasonable. Any responsible hunter, snowmobiler, atv rider, etc is respectful to the property and the owner. The people that are out causing problems are just disrespectful and will do whatever they feel like doing no matter what the legislation is.
Yes they should, 100% need to get permission from land owner first.	All land should be treated as the same	Permission should be granted by the land owner. If you do not know where the land owner lives you should not be allowed to hunt the land. Find an RM map and name of the land owner and call and make arrangements to meet and talk about getting permission.	Not at all. This would help recreational clubs and trails should be made on land that the clubs have permission from. This would help stop recreational vehicle users from getting a bad name from riding on posted land
Yes, there is no reason that someone needs to be on my land or anyone else's. As a land owner i bought my land its mine. No one should be able to just drive on or walk on for there own fun. I might as well farm someone elses land then.	Yes all land. If its not yours you should need permission	Should be written permission	Not at all
No, i think that's a little excessive. Soon farmers and land owners are going to be complaining about the 50 people a day coming to the door during hunting season. The current system is fine. Dont want people on the land then post it and check your signs, I know it might be a pain but it goes with owning the land.	I think it should all be treated the same.	If you over complicate this it's going to be more of a pain in the [redacted] than it is already.	This is something that looks like a good idea to the farmers but once everyone is knocking on there door I'm not sure they'll be happy about that.
		If land is posted in anyway that's when permission should be needed otherwise no permission should be needed	It would be almost impossible to gain permission on every peice of land a person wants to hunt. Especially bird hunting as flocks move sometimes daily so gaining permission every time the flock moves would turn into a permission hunt instead of a bird hunt.
yes	no difference your land is your land whether it is fenced or not.	there should be some way of accessing owner contact number, such as in the case of hunting in rural area, it can be difficult to know who to ask, if you are not familiar with an area	no because generally I think people do not go on private property for recreation, there is already lots of wildlife lands and ducks unlimited land to access for recreation, and access to lakes and rivers are already granted , so consent is not unreasonable in this case
Yes that should be the case	All land treated the same	Rural municipal maps should have different colour designations for lands that are admisible from those that aren't. Email addresses for those controlling the land whether that is land owner or operator should be made available through Crop Insurance	It might be for snowmobiles which could be handled with an exception on farmland that does not have any fenced boundaries.
Yes	All land used for agricultural purposes should be the same.....permission from landowner required	By phone if I know them.....direct contact if I don't know them.....proof of ID may be required for people I don't know...	No....hunters, quaders need to have permission to go on others land. Just because you are hunting or own a quad does not give you the right to go on my land. Anyone who asks to hunt on my land is rarely denied permission, unless my cows happen to be in the place where they want to go. I am sick of having gate posts cut off with a chain saw, right beside a Private Property No Trespassing sign, because I have the gate padlocked shut..... I am sick of putting my cows back in the pasture when I should be combining because someone cut the fence to access my pasture....I have even put a Texas gate into one pasture, for the quads and ATV'S.....and I still have trouble with gates and wire cutting. Snowmobiles I don't mind....I always fix the fences before I let the cows out....so any cut wires are repaired at that time....but the Quaders and hunters are a curse! Quaders can't go past a mud hole without rutting it up with power turns....doesn't matter if it's in the middle of a hay field....driving over wet fields in the spring making ruts that you can see all summer because of compaction....I can't go to town/city and pull power turns on someone's lawn and get away with it....why do people think that a farmer's land is there for everyone to enjoy and destroy? There are miles and miles of back roads and trails that can be ridden out here without having to go on to farm land.
No	No		Yes
yes	all the same	verbal and or written if needed	no if you cant pick up the phone or knock on a door you dont need to be there that bad

No	Should be a distinction	Land owners and numbers should be provided to the public with ease of access. Very hard to track down land owners sometimes. Verbal consent over the phone would be sufficient.	Yes, hikers, hunters, etc. Would always have to be mindful of property barriers instead of enjoying hunting, hiking etc. Less likely to engage in rural recreational activities.
This will not change bad behaviour. The laws are reasonable now. Owners that want to post their land already do while others do not. If the goal is to reduce trespassing etc. Criminals will find a way always have. Rural crime will still be a growing concern. The main thing this hinders is law abiding citizens.	Pretty self explanatory already. A majority of people know the difference or do the research. At what expense? If this were to come out of public funds I dont see the purpose. Also if for example a farmer now has to pay extra somehow to distinguish his land. That's another cost for what is already a struggling industry in our world economy.	As always. Most level headed people either ask in person or by phone. Seems reasonable	Yes. This is a major part of the economy in rural areas as well as the prairie provinces. Also things such as hunting and fishing have traditiona roots. Just making it harder on a younger generation and also a way for people to automatically close off land because they dont want the extra hassle.
Yes	No	Written permission	No
Privately owned land should require permission to be accessed. Public land occupied by livestock should require permission to be accessed. Public land not containing livestock and that is not occupied or belonging to a protected area (ie park) should be accessible without permission. If someone owns their own property or has legally borrowed/leased/occupied publicly owned land, permission should be required to access, out of respect for the owner/occupier, and out of concerns of safety for the ones requesting access.	Treated as the same. If someone owns/occupies the property legally, they should be approached for permission to access.	Permission should be sought either in person by approaching the owner/occupier at their residence on the property, or by contacting the owner/occupier by another means of communication (phone or email) by having the owner/occupier post this contact information on the boundary of the property, or have it available to those who request it for legitimate access purpose from some central location (ie R.M office) with the owner/occupier's permission.	It could be in instances where there is an immediate need to access land. Ex; while hunting on property you have permission to be on, you shoot an animal and it crosses a boundary into a property you do not have permission for, and dies on this property. The hunter must clean a kill to avoid any wasting of meat and this must be done quickly. If the owner/occupier of the property has placed markers with contact info in accessible places along their boundary and the hunter can make quick contact with them to receive permission, they should. If there is no means of contacting the owner/occupier from the field and the hunter cannot, in a reasonable time frame, locate and approach the occupied dwelling of the owner/occupier, and if the hunter can respectfully enter the property to retrieve their kill and quickly vacate the premissis, they should be allowed to do so.
Yes	All the same		
no	same	dunno	not unreasonable no
I dont think there should be any written permission for wild life lands or habitat trust lands but for private land i would say yes to land visibly being farmed.	I say no. Cultivated land land that has standing crop or cut crop is farmed land. Pasture is not.	New land owner Rm maps should now be made with names and phone numbers to make asking or phoning for permission that much easier. If permission is a high priority, then make it easier by updating RM maps with land owners names and phone numbers!	yes it impairs recreational activities by restricting land use
Only if standing crop is on the land. Only if a house is in view of the land. Only if cattle is on the land.	Should be able to hunt on pasture land as long as there is no cattle on the land	Have land owners contact info on fence at gate to land	Yes. If hunters can't hunt on farm land then farmers should not have insurance on the crops. Hunters help control the deer populations.
Yes !! It should not be the responsibility of the land owner to pay for or to just dismiss property damages by people who are reckless and irresponsible !! Most people would be very upset if a stranger didnt knock on their door but just walked in and helped themself to whatever was inside and made a mess /destroyed property ! It's only respect and commonsense to ask before PERMISSION	ALL land should be treated the same common courtesy and the respect of lands being used !!	Written permission would protect both parties and could be shown to officers	No it should be followed by all who require to use other people's property again respect given may grant you the use in the future !
No they should not. Unposted lands should be accesible. That being said there should be changes made how land has to be posted for no hunting/trespassing. Make it more affordable and easier for land owners to mark. A good example of this is painting the tops of some signs with a high visibilty paint such as blaze orange. This would signify there is no hunting or trespassing on these lands. This way signs can not be torn down or damaged. Paint is a lot cheaper then signs. And a lot easier to mark more areas.	All land should be treated differently. Lots of farmers would never give permission to hunt on pasture land vs cultivated or fenced property	Onus should be on the hunter to seek permission. The landowner should not have to make any extra effort to grant permission	Yes

Yes	All land should be treated the same	Access granted only after personally talking to owner or occupier by most direct route to habitant. If no habitant then person(s) can access owner by appropriate municipality offices to get permission.	No! Having any variations cause confusion and an alibi. Having variation to the trespassing law is one of the causes of trespassing. The other is trespassing laws NEED to be enforced!!! All the laws can be in place but if it isn't enforced it does nothing. Recreational or not ...trespassing is trespassing. Let's keep it simple and real.
Yes	Yes	Direct in person or verbal via phone or text	Yes
yes	All land should be treated the same. As a rural landowner this is my property that I paid for regardless of what I am using it for. I paid the land mortgage and I own it. I didn't buy it for the general public to access for their private reasons!!!	Access by main access point - yes Access through municipal office providing a telephone contact contact number - yes Contact via email - no	No. There needs to be more control for landowners to know who is on their land. Perhaps these people who participate in recreational activities should take a long hard look at themselves and their disrespectful behavior on private land. Pastures and fall seeded crops ripped up by quads and fences crushed by snowmobiles crossing snowdrifts that are over fences are examples. As far as I am concerned the recreational activity people caused this problem, not the landowner. As a landowner, I feel no generosity or obligation to make land access easy or an entitlement. If these recreational people need a field to "rip up", then find \$300,000 and buy a quarter of land just like I did. Perhaps if they paid for it themselves, they would respect it!
The land owners that dont want you hunting on their land post it "no hunting" the way the rules are now are perfectly fine. I know lots of farmers that hate being bothered by hunters to get permission and whenever i ask they say its "not posted" so go ahead	No	It shouldnt be needed.	This is getting out of hand.
Yes! Time to protect land owners rights, we have been needing something like this to help curb crime for a long time now.	All should be treated the same. Some people cant tell the difference	By phone, email, in person on most direct route to the residence	No, because your skidooring or quadding over farmland isnt a right. It's a privilege thats earned or allowed.
No	Yes	Phone or written	
YES	All land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	in person by most direct route to residence, or - through landowner contact information at municipal office. Permission in writing would avoid confusion.	It would not. And landowners should not be liable for any injury or loss by others while on their (the landowners') property, whether or not permission was obtained.
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	Landowner information (phone number or e-mail address) should be made public by the RMs via landowner permission. Verbal consent would suffice for land access.	I don't think so. Planned activities are more enjoyable for all involved. The thinking that one's recreation is more important than another's property rights is preposterous.
No	Distinction between them	Sometimes land is owned by people outside of Province. Sometimes it is convenient to ask the landowner at a nearby residence but it isn't always the case. And email address or phone number should be posted on the signs to contact the landowner .	Yes it would be unreasonable. I think this legislation is excessive and there are a lot of other ways to ensure compliance with recreational users of land, while respecting the landowners .
Yes, but under the condition that all landowners make their phone number available for inclusion on RM maps to aid the public in contacting the landowner for permission. Currently, a challenge for users seeking recreational use of private land is that the landowners phone number is not available on the RM maps and since the introduction of mobile phone numbers, it is very difficult to track down the land owner to seek permission.	All land should be treated the same.	RM offices and maps should have the phone number and an email address to contact the landowner. Furthermore, text messages shall be deemed written consent for permission to access land. A text message is the least intrusive way for a landowner to communicate their consent.	This change would be an unreasonable impediment unless contact information in the form of a phone number are not readily available to all members of the public.
Yes	They should be treated the same	Most direct route from nearest access point	It would definitely affect snowmobiling. I'm not sure how that could be rectified. I'm sure the biosecurity risk is lower in the winter.

Yes	All land treated the same	Contacted before accessing	As a hunter, before accessing any land, I always seek permission, so this would not affect me. As for snowmobiling or ATVing, this may push to more use of designated trail systems
No			
No	There should be a distinction between each said property.	Verbal and or written consent.	Yes, For sure. Extremely unreasonable.
Not for legal hunting, gathering and respectful outdoor activities.	Fenced property already has a provision that permission must be acquired for hunting activities.	Door knocking, phone numbers. Landowners could state permission for access on land.	Saskatchewan is one of the largest outdoor havens in the world. Landowners have the right under the current laws to place signage (available from the rm) requesting individuals to not access land without express permission currently. For individuals in areas where landowners are hard to contact it would make activities like hunting, fishing, camping and snowmobiling harder to pursue. I believe changes to these rules would result in a loss of freedom and a reduction in participation in these activities which would adversely affect the individuals that wish to pursue these activities.
If the land is posted then the hunter should need to get permission . If the land is not posted then the hunter should be able to hunt on it unless told by landowner to leave. The hunter should be required to close all gates and not leave the areas used In hunting in worse conditions than found.	Fenced land is an issue when people are not closing gates after gaining access to the property. This causes loss of profits and damage.... ex... cattle on road could be hit by vehicles.....	Non posted land.... verbal or written Posted land written permission.	Yes it would unless on posted land.
You should have permission	If not fenced should have access	I meet with landowners and its always been verbal	No it's their land
Not if land thats not posted if fields off because alot times next impossible find out whos land it is and ive asked where surrounding lsnd owners dont know whos it is.	If unoccupied no buildings in site and not posted should be able hunt there first nations would be so why white people being picked on. If this gos threw then farmers shouldnt be allowed crop insurance.	Verbal or written if need be	Yes be huge drop in hunting revenue. I know guys said so hard get permission so hunt non posted land but if gos through their done hunting id be same
No	Treated the same	Permission should only be needed if posted	Yes
Yes!!	Should be treated the same, need permission to be on it	Verbal	Absolutely NOT!
No	All land should be treated the same and be open	By telephone, land owners phone numbers should be made public. Posted land should have to include a contact number on the posted sign	100% would make activities more difficult to do
No	There should definitely be a distinction between the types of land.	In writing or by email. Verbal consent can be argued.	It will definitely cause a major decline in sportsmen. It will lead to "pay for play-access" and in turn lead to major fluctuations in wildlife populations.
No	No should be posted no hunting. But should ask for permission from land owner/renter	No but info signs or no trespassing signs should have a phone number on them. Then can seek permission and land owner will have a lot less issues with people just going on the land	Asking permission would be a good thing. It would probably hinder some of the activities. And maybe have a effect on the economy
If it isnt posted no trespassing or no hunting I believe people should be able to access the land as long as they respect it and follow the current rules in the wildlife act and synopsis. The people that dont follow the rules and go on posted land without permission will always break the rules anyways. Changing the rules just makes it harder for the respectable people to get access.	All land should be treated the same. Dont shoot around cows and dont cut fences or leave gates open. It's that easy. If you dont want people on your land you should simply post it.	Knocking on doors and using an rm map and a phone is how I get permission.	Yes. If you dont want people on the land u simply have to post it. Maybe the government can have a program that helps farmers with the cost of posting there land if they have an enormous amount.
Yes	All land treated the same	Written	No
Only if this applies to everyone, no exceptions!	Yes, there should be a distinction.	Agree with above examples.	It would in sparsely inhabited areas.

<p>Most hunters in Saskatchewan are not bad hunter but only hunt for a weekend of 2 each year. They do not have the time to do the scouting ad research that serious hunter do to scout ahead. They go to the places the they hunted with their fathers and friends for years. If they change this law to need permission you are going to lose at least 70 present of all Saskatchewan hunters over the next 5 years this will end up being the end of gun stores. And of hunting because this lack of license money will cause the government to end it because it does not Pay when you get drawn for moose in zone 19 you will not be able to hunt zone 19 just the 2 or 3 or 4 farms that you have permission for If the moose has walked over to the next farm i might take you 2 weeks to get permission What about calling coyotes were you Might do 15 stands a day but only 30 minutes to an hour on a farm</p>	<p>I must be the same because they are to close the differ</p>	<p>Can not work the farmer in not going to give permission to someone He do not know and you might have to drive from Yorkton to Regina to meet him What about calling coyotes were you Might do 15 stands a day but only 30 minutes to an hour on a farm</p>	<p>YES YES YES</p>
<p>No, land owners should use signs otherwise it's free to hunt. Etc..</p>	<p>Obviously a distinction if no signs it's fair game. Need common sense. If caught on wrecking or leaving fence gates open or cutting wires there should be fines etc.</p>	<p>If no hunting/traspassing signs are up. Figure out who owns it and ask for permission</p>	<p>No not unreasonable. If you can see crop or cattle etc. Don't go in. Contact land owner if you have to retrieve etc.</p>
<p>No, as a Saskatchewan resident we should have the right to go anywhere in sask with out causing damage to land. As asking for permission that owner can pick who stay's and goes giving an uneven advantages to sask residents.As a person that's travels across sask for recreation there is very little land to access already and land bought by sask federation is very hard to access as its posted on both sides and very wet yearly.As a result people are still in joying the FREEDOM IN SASK, there would have to be tons of signs with names and numbers to call plus sask doesn't have good cellular service and may not be able to make that call.As a Canadian you have to think of language barriers and communication as we are a multicultural country. There is a lot more to this then NO TRESPASSING. Farm land should NOT be able to post NO TRESPASSING after there crop is removed.</p>	<p>no, all land is different and the uses it provides calling it the same things is not right.</p>	<p>For one, not all people know how the internet works, and don't needed it on the property, ( my grandparents as example). So email is out. Also not all people have smart phones or want them too.So that's out.There are different langues in our country and not all speak good English/ French, and would need all custom sign posted with home address and numbers as would be invading privacy trying to get permission plus who pays for that sign's the farmer. Also as early season starts the farmers are busy working the field and would not be able to give consent fast enough. Also not all of sask has cellular service.( I have waited 6+ hrs to get NO PERMISSION well the farmer was busy working), So i'v wasted my day's waiting for reply's and sometimes its rented and not knowing the real owner. I have gotten RM maps before but it's an extra cost for them and you need several if going in different areas. Also all licenses in sask have gone up with less and less land to harvest on by posting sign ( how is that far),plus the time the farmer would lose during the busy season dealing with 1000's of calls / emails/ call backs.</p>	
		<p>Not going to happen, then all land is posted and then nobody can harvest like our Ancestry have done since start of time. We have the right to fish and hunt and if all land is posted we will lose all rights and then we are directed to eat chemical filled meat and produce that the government imports. There is a fix NO TRESPASSING until crop is removed, and if damage created on property there is a fine. and remove all no hunting and trespassing sign's and were no live stock is located.</p>	
<p>No, the current laws are fine</p>	<p>Same</p>		<p>Absolutely If it was a requirement to gain permission it would turn into a pay for play type of system where as only the wealthy would be able to afford those activities</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>No distinction</p>	<p>Permission should only be required if the land is posted and if that's the case then the most direct route</p>	<p>Absolutely yes</p>
<p>Yes!!!!</p>	<p>Both should be treated the same.</p>	<p>By going to the government or going through the conservation officer.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Yes. Express permission should to be required for any rural land, regardless if pasture, vacant, or cultivated. Offense should high fines along with loss of hunting privileges for a set period of time.</p>	<p>All land treated as the same</p>	<p>Attending a residence to ask for permission. Along with contact name, number and description of vehicle.</p>	<p>No it doesn't make an unreasonable impediment. A hunter who cannot take the time to contact a landowner, is a hunter that cannot be trusted to take the time to have an ethical harvest of an animal.</p>

<p>No, most of these lands were inherited, or bought at high prices that the average Joe hunter can not afford. I live on the [REDACTED] and the government is selling that land. Combined with farmers from the south spending millions on previously open forest quarters, there is now no south access to the forest. Due to the decrease of available hunting land in the south many hunters are coming up this way and stressing out wildlife to the max. If I had the means to buy a large portion of land I would, as would most hunters, but we don't and the available land to hunt on is getting smaller and smaller while the number of hunters increases. This is ludicrous, if having people come onto one's land is that big of an issue for them then I suggest they show it by posting all their land clearly. No one has time to track down an RM map, find phone numbers and worry about if they gonna get a fine for accidentally going on land that wasn't fenced or marked. Hunting is a lot of work by itself, scouting, equipment, time off work, don't make it even more difficult.</p>	<p>Yes there should be a distinction</p>	<p>If a landowner wants people to obtain permission before entering his or her land then they must make their home location and phone number available so that they can be contacted easily.</p>	<p>Absolutely, as I stated in a previous answer, access to the south end of porcupine provincial forest is cut off from the south. Nearly all the land in the zone 48 and more and more in 56 is private land, the people up here are reclusive and hard to get hold of to ask permission, I've lived here for almost a year now and in that time I've been able to contact only 2 landowners for lack of information to find them. Many people come here to quad and enjoy other recreational outdoor activities, when all the land is bought up and posted what will we do? This hurts our local power sports dealers, this hurts local accommodation owners, and it hurts local business because people aren't coming up as much anymore.</p>
<p>I do believe that all members of the public, regardless of the reason, needs to have written permission from the land owner.</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same. This way we can also control the distribution of noxious weeds and other things that can contaminate the soil</p>	<p>Permission can be from a phone call or more importantly face to face. Most landowners know when it's hunting season or if they have a great slough for doing mud drags in. I will not be offended by someone walking up to the door of my house, ringing the doorbell and asking me if they can go on my land. All permission should be in written form too.</p>	<p>No it would not. My land is for farming, first and foremost. If you want to go snowmobiling or atv'ing, become part of a snowmobile club. Atvs do much damage to our land, especially with the types of tires out there and the fact that snorkel kits are allowed and makes sloughs more of a recreational area also</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>All land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>At the on site inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point.</p>	<p>No, making consent an express requirement is not an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities.</p>
<p>Yes. It's private property. Should be same as a person's boat or truck or any other property. You ask to use it</p>	<p>It's all private owned should all be the same</p>	<p>Verbal should be adequate</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Any person who is wanting access to any rural land that is not occupied by said person wanting access, must need permission by land owner. Anybody not following these laws must be charged with trespassing offense. Simple rule, not yours, get off.</p>	<p>All land must be given the same purpose. If it's fenced, cultivated, or as pasture land, there must be a verbal or written permission by anybody that wants access to the land.</p>	<p>Permission must be given verbally, or written. Depending on the landowner.</p>	<p>Any recreational activities such as hunting, quading or leisurely activities, must be given permission by land owner.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Treated the same. It all needs permission</p>	<p>Get an RM map and a phone book</p>	<p>No it would be safer</p>
<p>Yes. Written permission should be required.</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Yes. RM's all have maps.</p>	<p>No. Everyone should be required to get permission. For all and any activities.</p>
<p>Yes. RM maps should also be made more accessible, and more affordable. If a hunter shows their tag to an RM office, it should be a \$5 fee for an RM map, to make them more willing and able to contact landowners for permission.</p>	<p>All agricultural land should be treated as such. Crops can be damaged by vehicle access much like cows can be spooked and run through a fence all costing money to replace. Agricultural land should all be treated as such.</p>	<p>Have a name on an RM map, and be given a local phone directory with that map. Make it easy to communicate, and you'll avoid people trying to make it easier by cheating.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Verbal or written before hand</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes, only if this applies to EVERYONE. Not just one group of people</p>	<p>All land if it is private no matter what for should be treated the same. Only if it applies to EVERYONE.</p>	<p>we have access to RM PDF maps, there should be a requirement by the RM's to keep them up to date with online access for individuals free of charge. with those we can determine who the land owner is and located either home location and from there contact information.</p>	<p>no its not an unreasonable impediment if applied to everyone equally</p>

<p>All access to private property or any property not owned by the members of the public whether the land is posted or not should require express permission from the owner of the property.</p>	<p>All privately owned land whether it fenced, cultivated, planted or any other use the owner sees fit should be treated as private and requires permission to enter the property whether it is posted or not. The public ignore No Trespassing signs I should not have to post my land to inform people that they don't own the land so stay off! Private land is private there should be no distinction with regards to use. Private keep out. If you don't own the land Keep Out!</p>	<p>Permission should be the responsibility of the individual seeking access to the land. I as a land owner should not be obligated to provide information or enhanced access to members of the public to come on my property for their recreational needs. All land is private, if you don't own it get permission from the owner or stay off. When I bought my land there was no mention that as a land owner I have to register personal information so people looking for Recreation Areas have a convenient way to find land owners personal information. Why should land owners have to provide a service to non land owners to find us? Permission should be sought by asking and getting permission or stay off private land whether it is posted or not. People on quads and snowmobiles have trespassed on my land without permission after driving past the No Trespassing signs clearly visible to them. They have told me when I have confronted them for trespassing they can go anywhere they want and that if they injure themselves while trespassing on my land they can sue me. Many of the people who buy these recreational vehicles have the right to leave their urban neighborhoods and drive these vehicles wherever they want. The Department of Highways encourages this behavior by transporting quads on Provincial Ferry's. They are allowed to drive on to the ferry?</p>	<p>NO! NO! NO! Rural land is private land. As a land owner I shouldn't have worry about the feelings of people looking for recreation areas. Get permission regardless of whether land is posted or not or stay off. These poor people who feel we as land owners are being unreasonable and impeding their fun times, should show respect to people who own their own land and choose to use it for their our own personal enjoyment. I think the Saskatchewan Government should make it clear to non land owners and land owners that there are laws, and the law should support private land owners to enjoy their property in peace. If you don't own the land get permission or stay off the property whether it is posted or not.</p>
<p>No.</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Permission should be sought through rural municipality offices. Have land owners contact info available through rm office.</p>	<p>Yes it would.</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>No distinction</p>	<p>More contact information should be included on RM maps, Hunters should still be able to drive into a yard site to ask the land owner for permission if the land owner lives near by, some land owners may not live in the area or the land may be owned by a corporation creating it very hard for someone to gain permission onto land.</p>	<p>I fear that changes to the trespassing laws will eventually lead to paid access for hunting which is a common practice in the USA, only the rich would be able to afford to hunt on private land and the majority of average families wanting to hunt would not be able to afford to take their kids hunting which would result in those kids being more at risk for being involved in unlawful activities. When I hunt I prefer to get permission on the land I hunt on, even when it is not posted however sometimes it can be impossible to determine who a land owner is as farming is not the same as it used to be, there are large corporations that own land with no contact info on RM maps, Large farmers may live somewhere else in the province with no contact info, land owners may live out of province. So yes these changes would have a negative impact on the average hunting family. For hunting and fishing I would be disappointed if changes were made for mandatory permission on land that is not posted. If land owners demand that a change is made then I would recommend meeting in the middle, if land is not posted then hunters can still hunt on foot without gaining permission and a vehicle may be used to retrieve legally killed game, if hunters want to drive on land while hunting then permission would be required.</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>all land should be treated the same</p>	<p>Permissions should be granted by an adult owner and written consent should be granted signed by owner and persons and the most direct route should be used a municipal road. not all people have emails so they should be contacted by telephone or in person</p>	<p>no if the landowner does not want recreational vehicles on their land they should have the right to impede all users</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>No difference</p>	<p>Verbal communication</p>	<p>Yes absolutely</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Should all be treated as agriculture purposes</p>	<p>It should sought by the the land owner or renter, there should be a paper document to prove such an agreement has been made. And for certain days requested</p>	<p>Absolutely</p>
<p>We believe there should be permission of the rural land owner or occupier as we do that now &amp; for the safety of those who may be on/using the land</p>	<p>Permission should be asked for all land</p>	<p>Permission should be sought with reasonable means- we currently try to find the homestead using the RM map, the phone book, neighbors, etc.</p>	<p>We either ask for permission to hunt on land, have outfitter rights to it or it is crown land/provincial park that we do not have to ask permission for.</p>

	Do not change the act	For posted land or surveys from land owners	Yes
No, it should not be this way.	There should be distinctions. Open stubble and natural areas on farmland should be property openly accessible to public where as pasture, posted & fenced areas, and active agricultural land should be respected and left alone.	In person when possible. By phone or email or text should be allowed too. I don't feel written permission is necessary if landowner and the person accessing that land share an understanding	Absolutely. I've had instances where I had permission on certain quarter sections to hunt, then the big game animal decides to mosey onto an unposted and open & apparently accessible quarter. In that instance I was able to call said animal back, but had it been the last day I was able to hunt, I may not have had time to coax the animal back to my quarter of permission and my freezer would have been empty for an entire year. It does not just impede my ability to hunt, but my ability to feed my family.
Yes, people should first get permission before going onto someone's land	It should all be treated the same as it is someone's land	The person wanting to go on someone's land should find the owner and ask in person if they could go on it	No it would not.
No, but rules to what constitutes "posted" land should be made clear and followed. It should also be made easier to determine WHO to ask to get permission. It is frustrating to never know who's land is who's, who is the owner, who is renting it, etc.	There should certainly be a distinction, and it should be made very clear.	Posted email addresses or phone numbers, included in online RM maps would be helpful. Maybe even online maps that include information about conditional posting (no hunting while cattle are present for example) or land that the owner is always ok with hunters/atv/snowmobiles and would rather not even have to deal with people calling.	Yes, if the person seeking consent has to spend a lot of time and effort tracking down the owner.
No, People should have access unless the land is posted. You will get into scenarios like the USA is in now. "Pay for play". You dont want people on your land, that is fine, post it then. The arguement that diseases are spreading because of traffic is null. The farmers are also spreading these, not just the general public,do they wash their tires everytime they visit friends or relatives? Some do , some don't. Its easy to penalize the hunter, the fisherman, the outdoor enthusiasts but when it comes to companies that have the money, thats the only time the government stands up and takes notice.	No. Keep it simple. Post it if you dont want people on. People shouldnt need to be lawyers understand laws.	People can do the legwork. Make RM maps free. Know who owns the property. If it is posted then call to see if they can gain access.	Yes. Its unreasonable. Less and less land is accessible to the public making things like hiking cross country skiing, Not just hunting a thing of the past. I have neighbors that already post their land so that only they can enjoy the wildlife there. If people are accessing land and making it a mess maybe we should look at things like enforcement of litter and noise bylaws instead of restricting access.
Yes they should.	We think all land used for agricultural purpose should be treated the same.	We believe the individual seeking access be required to first seek permission by attending at any on site inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point.	No it wouldn't be an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities. They should have permission to be on the land.
No	There should be a distinction	By a main entry point	Yes
Yes there are too many people abusing privately owned land	All land used for agricultural use should be treated the same	By telephone or in person	It would make atv ers hunters and snowmobilers have to plan their activities. For land owners it would mean they could be contacted by multiple people for the same access
No if land owner doesn't want you on their land the should have it posted properly with signs of no trespassing or something like that	Land with a crop in should be considered differently. Most people know not to drive on a farmers crop but some still do. If you are caught driving in a farmers crop with any kind of motor vehicle you should be charged	You should be able to find it on rm websites. These websites should have public access to the maps and names of people who own the land. The landowners name and phone number should be on here also. The land owners address or legal land description should also be on here so public can find their residence	
No.	All land should be treated the same.	Written consent.	I think that it is an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities.
Not all land should inaccessible without permission. Rural Home Yardsites SHOULD have and increased protection and increased penalties for trespassing/stealing. Rural land that is not fenced or animals/crop present may be accessible.	Yes there should be distinction between the properties, but each type of the property should not be treated the same. Each property should have its own distinct legislation	If all land is made inaccessible without permission, a means to make the landowner or renters contact information should be made available. A color system could be used like montana where coloured signs give indication of the type of access available, a colour for each of No Hunting, Hunting on Foot, Hunting with Permission.	It would be impossible for snowmobilers to get all permission as they typically are covering long distances, ATV riders are of increased concerned due to potential damage caused and should have to ask for permission.

no	distinction	email addresses or phone numbers would be helpful as it would be trespassing already just going to ask permission.	no
Yes so long as the land owner isn't compelled to court. The onus should be solely on the trespasser to prove they had a right to be there. Many land owners fear retribution from individuals when they are required to testify in court. This leads to significant amounts of complaints leading nowhere due to land owner hesitation to testify, which further emboldens individuals who do this, and see little to no consequence. It does not matter what approach the province takes, if it requires people to testify, nothing will change.	I believe that only land being actively cultivated, or grazed or fenced should require prior consent. Any open pasture or farm land, unless otherwise posted somehow, should be available for hunting purposes. This would allow hunters to make use of certain unfenced lands once snow falls, and the field is not being used.	By most direct route to the home, written permission via note or text. Verbal should be allowed as well, however, without anything in writing any land user is taking the risk that a land owner may change their mind, or indicated otherwise to an officer resulting in possible charges.	As previously stated - if the land is being actively worked or grazed or is fenced then yes prior written consent required. If the land is unfenced and is currently not being used (i.e. snow over pasture) then access should be allowed for hunters, snowmobilers and others.
Yes	Land with active growing crops should have harsher fines/penalties.	In person.	No.
No, absolutely not.	There needs to remain a distinction.		
Yes. This legislation should also provide relief for the landowner safety to every person which liability, if any matter or thing may arrive, and/or, be consequence of, trespass without permission by non-permissible person or persons on land that is owned, purchased, rented, or leased by individual(s).	Saskatchewan already gives privity to leased agricultural crown land that is not used for agricultural purposes. I am unable to access land crown land, Not, used for agricultural purposes already. I have proof of this matter which I called the Board and described this to myself. Thus I cannot answer this question at all.	Permission should be sought and granted, solely by the landowner.	Access should be specified for any type of activity. example: hunting permission should be separate from snowmobile permission
Absolutely not.	There needs to remain a distinction.		
no	same	phone call	yes. it would be a pain if you had to get permission to snowmobile across someone's land
Yes. Rural landowners can't walk into a random backyard in Saskatoon or any other city/ town. Even though it is just a dirt plot that is still someone's property. You don't park on random driveways or have campfires in someone's backyard because you saw a fire pit. Why should it be any different just due to the fact the land is rural. Trespassing is not determined by what activity you are performing. it is determined by permission to be accessing the land you are travelling on. If you don't have permission to be on that land, you are trespassing. Simple as that.	It should all be the same. Someone else still owns it. Doesn't matter what it's being used for. Someone else's property is someone else's property. End of story.	contact the landowner and ask for permission. Verbal or written permission works. RM maps are available to see who owns the land. 411 and phonebooks give you the phone number. Don't use the excuse you don't know anyone so you can't ask permission.	No. It's not that hard to pick up a phone and call the landowner to see if you can access his land. Whether it be hunting, quadding, fishing, etc. You still need permission. I hunt and don't own any land but still call to get permission first. It doesn't pose any impediment what so ever. I also quad and don't cross any land I do not have permission to. Whether it be cultivated, fenced, or pasture land. Also as far as Treaty hunting and fishing rights, why can't first nations ask permission as well. It doesn't hurt anyone. It's nice for the landowner to now who is on their land.
No	No. Treat all land the same.	Through direct in person communication and or through phone, text or email communication.	Yes. Due to the fact that finding phone numbers to gain permission is becoming much more difficult due to the number of current and active land lines declining.
No.	Yes.		Yes.
Only for the home quarter (as this is essentially the farmer's backyard). The rest should be open access.	Distinction!	1. RMs should have to keep accurate records (updated annually prior to the start of hunting season) 2. Ownership and contact information (phone and email) should be deemed public knowledge for access, and be available at the RM office	It certainly has the potential to. Current unposted land is deemed to be implied consent, if there are not the administrative tools in place to provide the ability to contact owners for consent, this becomes unreasonable.
There is not enough public land in Saskatchewan for this to happen. Alberta has lots of lease land and wildlife areas that are available to hunt. A changing of Saskatchewan's laws towards Alberta's will leave a large amount of people who can't get permission and have nowhere to hunt	If the property has crop on it or cattle then you should need permission	Phone, email, or in person	Yes, not enough public land for activities would leave many with nowhere to go. This includes hunting, snowmobiling and other activities that rely on farmland
Yes	yes	From the land owner. There should be an email directory available at the RM Office that would be given out to hunters, hikers, etc.	You pay to play. Prior permission would likely curb "spur of the moment" theft, vandalism.
This is [redacted] and [redacted] way should they allow people to trespass on land owners land without getting permission first. Manners and morals people.	It's called common sense if there is a pasture you leave the gates closed. Not all land is the same pasture land can be unbroken and valuable meaning has sentimental significance. Farmed land is different it's sprayed and treated	By talking to the land owner in advance before you go onto their land	Absolutely

Yes it should	All agricultural land should be treated the same.	First the option should be to contact the owner at or on the property. If this is difficult/impossible because of difficulty of locating the owner/operator, then the owner or operator should work through the RM office to provide their information which would then be able to be given to the public. We must be conscious of privacy rules and not be freely giving out phone numbers or email addresses without the proper authorization.	No it wouldn't. Land owners should not have to "post" their land year after year. This is an unnecessary expense and time waster for the owner/operator. These signs are often damaged or removed by those who choose not to respect the rural property owners.
No	Treated the same	Permission to access should be scrapped. Coming from a landowner	Yes. It would hamper many activities we all enjoy.
No	No		
No	No	Email, phone numbers readily available	Yes for lawful hunting activities as we as snowmobiling
		Asking verbal prior permission	
Yes, it should. Someone has paid for that land and it is their property. You have no right to be on their property if they don't know you, haven't asked you to be there or given their permission to be there if you've asked to be there.	All land should be treated the same. Again, it's someone's property. You have no right to be there no matter what type of land it is.	Technically, they should have written consent to prove that they are allowed to be there.	
They should have written permission on all land before entering even if they are retrieving game	All should be treated the same	In person permission	Snowmobile is a little different. As long as no winter crops are seeded I have no trouble with them going across. ATVs should have permission period
Yes, any access to private land, you need the owners permission.	No, it would get too complicated. Private land is private land.	I feel this is one of the biggest obstacles. I hate going door knocking. I feel like I'm a pain in the bugging people at their home. It sure would be nice if you could walk into a RM office and get the names and numbers of the people that allow hunting. You could then contact them for permission.	Again, permission should always be asked. It is just difficult to get permission with the current system.
Yes...express permission should be required. Private property is just that , private property and a definition of rural or urban need not be made....	All land should be treated equally...express permission should be required. Someone either owns, rents or leases the property and therefore should be afforded the same respect no matter what enclosure or boundary is evident.	Land titles (ISC) has owner information on the web site. Look it up or get a map from the local rural municipality. Rural landowners rarely have all their land in one "chunk" therefore it is imperative they know who owns the land they want access to, and it may be nowhere near the actual residence of that owner. In this day it is very simple to "google" a number or address of almost anybody. If there is a residence, then yes, by all means..a direct route to the door of the residence would be satisfactory...not a cruise around the entire yard "looking for someone".	No, that would make it better. Respect needs to be shown towards the landowner. As a rural land owner that has farmland and pasture along a lake, we have had serious issues in the past. They can access the beach by boat, fine that is ok..but no campfires on dry pasture. We have put out fires and asked people to leave because they started the pasture on fire. I have had a snowmobiler tell me he carries wore cutters just to cut fences so he can go wherever he wants. I confronted a stranger, a man I had never seen before, on my land at a point where he drove past two or three no trespass signs (depending on route he took) and when I asked if he saw the signs, and he replied "I did not think they meant me". Who did they mean then?? When we found we had to lock our pasture gates from people letting our cows out, we had unknown persons leaving human feces on our gate handles. Seriously! And to top it off..if the cows get out and die from eating crops that will kill them...it is whose fault?? who pays?? Plus if you crash your vehicle into some washout on my property or get hit by a bull because you are in his pasture..it is my liability insurance that kicks in...whether or not you had permission... Permission needs to be gained before access of any kind!
Permission should only be granted for hunting rights as well as entering personal properties such as a person yard. Than an offence should carry out. Otherwise people should have the right too cross land with ATV and Snowmobiles only if it's not posted should be exempt from the offence.		Signature of a paper or verbal conversation with land owner	If it's not posted people should be allowed too go with ATV and Quad. It's not fair if your sledding and have too go ask permission too every single land owner. This would make tough for people too enjoy these leisure activities
No the current law just needs to be enforced!	Definitely should be differentiation. Ie hunting access on un used land.	Verbal should be adequate, most direct route to house	Yes especially with the large number of absentee land owners!!

No.	It should all be treated the same.	Telephone or email, with available landowner contact information database, and timeframe for approvals to avoid trespassers saying they had approval from previous years.	
No I believe if the land owner does not want you on their land then they should be required to post it properly with signs of NO TRESPASSING or something like that. It is a lot easier for them to do that than have public run around to all farmers for permission. Also risk of person being on the wrong quarter but if it's posted there will be no question	No all private land is the same and needs to be posted if land owner doesn't want you on there.	If land is posted then public will need permission from land owner either by phone or driving to land owners residence. All rm maps should be accessible on website so public can find out who owns land at anytime and not have to run around sask buying maps from all different rms	Yes it is unreasonable. Just think of how much time it would take to contact each individual land owner every time you want to go do some activity that requires you to go on a farmers field. Like sledding quadding hunting or whatever because you may end up on 50 different land owners places. WOW JUST CRAZY
No	Yes there should be a distinction.	I don't believe there needs to be permission if the land is not a homestead or being currently farmed at the time of hunting then shouldn't need to get permission. However if there needs to be permission there should be land owner signs posted with either email or phone number on them so the hunter knows who to contact. Not always easy to figure out who owns the land.	Same as previous comments.
Yes. Written permission.	All land treated the same.	Written permission. Time frame and specific lands.	No. Make all users more responsible and aware they are using someone else's property.
Yes	No they should all be treated the same	In our Municipal office we will contact landowners on behalf of those seeking legitimate access. If the land owners chooses they may contact the individual seeking access.	No No many properties in our municipality have been severely damaged due to "recreational" activities. This would be an instance where these individuals should be required to gain permission. If they want to use land for recreational purposes they should purchase their own land or receive permission.
Absolutely, Yes	Yes	With Written Permission	No Yes
Yes	all agricultural land treated the same.	Use of RM map to find legal land owner, search for contact information by their own means.	No. Many producers sow winter/fall crops for example, or may have newly formed drainage systems that pose a risk to public safety if the recreationalists are not aware of their location. There are many areas already developed for the use of snowmobiles, ATV's, etc, and it should not be up to the land owners to provide a place for recreationalists to use without informed consent. It is in the best interest of both parties.
No	Yes	Written	Yes
no	Yes all land for ag treated the same	If permission is required, contact info should be posted on the sign that states no trespassing	YES very unreasonable and would be a HUGE impediment for recreational activities
Yes I agree	No. Depending on current usage and terrain.	Direct contact with the land owner and or leaser.	My only concern is for hunting not quading etc.
yes written permission	all land used for agriculture be treated the same	get info from municipal offices	our concern is not the impediments of their activities our concern is the livelihood we gain from the land and everyones safety including our animals
In most cases yes. The winter snomobile or quading on rural land seems a bit harsh as it is accepted practice.	I think a distinction would be a good idea. Cultivated land and fenced property should be protected more than open pasture or crown land. This gives some access to the public to land for ATV or snowmobiles.	Granting access through the RM office would work the best. Land on an RM map van sometimes be difficult to find owner name. Having a contact number listed for that land location would help out emmensly.	No it would not

Yes the landowner is the steward of the land and makes his living off the land,pays the lease and taxes. Knows it better than anyone else. On native grass by driving on it you can damage it even if you don't know.	Should be treated the same. It belongs to and is used for agricultural purposes whether cattle or grain	Contact landowner or lessee for permission	The landowner knows best if it is too dry for someone to drive a vehicle or atv. And it somehow liable if something goes wrong it has been done for years requesting permission it is not unreasonable
Should have permission I have sat in the bush at my parents and had unknown people come onto their land and start shooting. They have no clue I am in that bush if they would have asked they would have been told their are hunters already on the land. If it is unacceptable to go onto someone's land why at hunting season do people think it is Ok?	Treat it the same regardless of the use. A person's land is theirs they paid for it. Bob in the city should have no right to just come onto land and hunt without written permisson	Permission should be in writing and land owner should have the right to revoke permission if they choose in which case the will be notified and a call or email should be sent to notify they do not have permission. So maybe a permission registry online.	
No	Yes they should all be treated that way unless otherwise posted.	Written with signature.	Of course.
yes	all land should be treated the same	The most direct route that uses PUBLIC ROADS. The person should not set foot onto the property without written permission. Find out who owns the property and RESPECTFULLY go to their home and seek permission.	No. The urban population has a tendency to believe that all land out side the city is there for their enjoyment. Urban residents need to be told that if you don't own the land then stay off. just because you own an ATV, snowmobile or are a hunter does not give you special privileges.
No, especially for hunting.	They should be treated the same. As an alternative, a tradeoff could be made by treating only fenced properties differently.	With absentee landowners it is difficult to even know who owns the lands. If permission is required for posted lands, the municipal office must have the legal rights to provide that information	Yes it would, particularly for hunting. It also severely limits snowmobile activity.....not everyone has ready access to formal trails. My family does both and we would probably have to give these activities up.
No.			
yes	all privietly owned land should be treated the same.		
	Distinction		
No. I believe land owners should post their land if they so choose. I'm 25 and have been hunting this way all my life.	Treat them the same.	Owners who wish to should post contact information on their no trespassing signs.	Yes the earth is for everyone. I feel it would be unreasonable to require permission on all land. there are enough posted spots already.
No	Yes all land should be treated the same. If the owner wants to restrict access they should post the land.	Unless posted permission should not be required.	Yes.
Yes	No	Call or go directly to owner to get permission	No.
Yes	All agriculture land should be treated the same	Written permission	No it's private property and people should get written permission
No	There should be a difference	There would have to be a website accessible for free with land owners phone numbers so you can call and get permission	Yes of course
YES, it's the 21 century. Lets get with the times. Private property is PRIVATE PROPERTY!!!!	All agriculture land is the same, private property	Use a phone/ it can not be that difficult.	NO, GET PERMISSION. No one would put up with that in the city.
Yes. I would like to see that consent in writing.	all land treated the same	it should be sought in writing BUT this question is flawed by assuming that permission would be granted. poor wording	no. I am tired of dealing with hunters, snowmobilers etc who NEVER ask and seem to view the countryside as their own playground
Written permission should be required for access under any circumstances.	It should all be treated the same. Signage or fencing should not be needed	Come to my door or write me a letter. Only way	No. It's my land and I decide who and what goes on my property
No, crown land should be accessible after the occupier is finished annual activity such as farming or grazing cattle	The needs to be a distinction between cultivated and open pasture, fenced crown land needs to be included in the distinction.	Yes, permission should be sought and granted for all privately owned land and occupied crown land during the occupiers annual activity. Drive to the residence or look on an RM map and phone the owner/occupier before going onto the land.	Yes it would, especially on crown land and the previous PFRA pasture lands. Occupiers of such land should have no exclusive rights to the land after the annual activity is complete.
Yes	All treated the same	RM office where a listing can be maintained of properties with either: 1) open access 2) no access allowed, or 3) contact information to request permission	Would not be unreasonable- would only require planning by those seeking access to private lands for recreational purposes

for the most part yes	all same	somewhat complicated, generally the person should not be seen to be shopping around	I think the wild west is gone and we don't want it back. I have no right to party on your lawn in the city why should you be entitled to my land. Access should be by express invitation only
This seems extreme especially during hunting season and I'm a farmer	No	You can try but with the government letting all the out of province land owners it would be impossible to contact someone in BC or Ontario	Of course it would maybe we should stop all hunting and let cars and trucks hit them which is costly and deadly
YES	SAME	Permission could be granted by three options : Direct contact with land owner at residence, Email, text/phone call. ***With any of the three options the person requesting permission must provide Landowner/operator : Name, Description of vehicle (Make/mode) plate # , phone number,Access Dates (ie) from Oct 1st-10th	No ,
No, not all access. Landowners do not own the wildlife and I don't think they should be able to restrict access to it. I would support no vehicles off roads and trails. Hunting on foot only.	It should all be treated the same.	If a permission is required then landowners should have to post their contact info so everyone can easily access it. Permission should be written so there is no gray areas for people to skirt	To hunting yes. Landowners do not own the wildlife and should not be able to restrict access to it. I do agree that vehicles should be on roads and trails only. Including snowmobiles and quads. Hunting on foot only.
No, land should be open to everyone unless posted that they dont want people on it.	All the same. Common sense should rule, if you open a gate, close it.	Current phone number and email address as well as current address the person is living at on every single quarter of land on an RM map. Even if that individual does not live in Canada	It would make it a lot more difficult for outdoorsman as well as land owners. Does a land owner really want the possibility of 100+ people a year contacting him trying to get permission? Sounds like a hassle for both parties...
Absolutely not, however if you are on land that is posted or has yet to be cultivated you should have a punishment that fits. Take your hunting, recreational motor license, bike, Treaty rights away for a year plus a fine. Keeping our famers happy, safe, and supported is very important not only to me but everyone who ever has thought about hunting.	The same for all	Signage as it now, if you knowing break those rules and disregard the signage again you should be punished. I don't think every farmer or land owner wants there phone ringing off the hook with people wanting to go from one quarter to the other. That will create frustration among many witch will lead to bad decisions.....	Well of course it would it would change everything and be a devastating blow that would all but destroy recreational activities all together.
No. They do not own the dirt or the animals or the air they breathe. All have been there long long before they chose to "own" the land. Anyone who is going to cause trouble is not going to ask for permission even if you make it the law. Pointless revision.	I think the distinction is important. Not all lands are the same and being used to the same effect.	It should be as it always has. Look for the homestead first, if you happen upon an animal in that time, then take the animal. If you can't find the owner and you already have the animal, go home. No sense in overcomplicating things.	This is an impediment that already exists. Contributing to this further would result in reduced following of the rules. Push too much and people will not (and should not) comply.
Yes	All should be treated the same	Written permission with names and phone numbers attached	You should need permission to be on someone's land regardless of the activity.
No.	It should be treated the same.	Either the landowner should be required to post contact information around their property or current contact information should be registered with the RM and available to those seeking permission. With the disappearance of landlines, it's become very difficult under current rules to obtain permission when it may be impossible to reach the stated land owner on an RM map.	Yes. In theory it seems harmless, but makes it difficult to adapt to changes on the fly when encountering hunting pressure in an area you planned to hunt.
Yes.	All land should be treated the same.	Directly through the land owner or user of the land.	No. What should be done. Land owners can manage who they want on the land.
Yes		Phone or in person	No it respects the land owner as it should.

<p>No. Never. This is about farm property. Current taxation, rural governance, and farm size. No one anticipated that one person can now own and operate a farm size of 20 to 80 quarters. Suddenly one person controls snowmobiles, ATV's, hiking, hunting on land masses over 20 square miles. Strangely this proposal does not affect the 10%-20% indigenous population. How about allowing each farmer to restrict all trespass on home quarter, residential acreages, intensive livestock operations, occupied pastures, crops. And allow other persons to use all other land owned for snowmobiles, ATV's, hiking and hunting. the default position is open use. Specific exceptions and restrictions could be made. The idea of making every land use an offense unless allowed by consent of a large "Land Baron" is offensive to common sense.</p>	<p>The idea of all land treated the same is repulsive to common sense. Creating new offenses is contrary to Saskatchewan tradition. Saskatchewan rural citizens and governments have always agued against "unnecessary laws" such as gun registries, carbon pricing. Yet they seem to want to make criminals out of "ordinary law abiding citizens" who safely and carefully snowmobile, quad, hike, and hunt on the vast land holdings of the modern Saskatchewan farm.</p>	<p>Permission should be obtained through contact in which all restricted land is clearly posted with name, phone, email of the owner. All ownership should be readily available to all people through the RM office. Permission is needed only for restricted land - residential property, home quarter, intensive livestock operations, specific land use (special situations), pasture land with livestock. The extremely large vast open fields, forests, pastures should not require permission.</p>	<p>Yes. This would be an unreasonable requirement. Express consent should be required of all residential acreages, farm residential areas, intensive livestock operations, special cases. pastures with livestock. Wide open fields, forests, wetlands, un-occupied pastures owed by "Large Land Barons" should be open use. All road allowances, fence lines, "easements" between quarters of land, whether cultivated or not, should always remain as open access to all. IMPACT OF CHANGE: 1. This is really about rural crime, yet not all citizens are included. Why not? Why are RM taxes so low and residential property exempt? An appropriate tax levee on ALL residential property and houses, ALL agricultural property and buildings, all land, would yield funds for improved enforcement and policing. 2. Wildlife management and protection ---- Why did the government remove over 1/2 of all CO's? Appropriate tax application on all assessment would pay for police and CO's. 3. Divisive policies ---- Don't create racist divides, rural -urban divides, wealthy large land owners - landless people divides. Only farmers are allowed snowmobiles, quads, hunting???? 4. Biosecurity ---- of course, but don't disguise privileged land ownership classes of people against the landless. Everyone knows that weeds, insects and pests spread by many methods.</p>
			<p>Of course some by quads and hunters, but snowmobiles?????. A red herring! 5. Public Land, Crown Land ---- The "privatising agenda" has led to removal of land for use by all. New and larger wealthy land barons want governments to help preserve their kingdoms from use by others. 6. Unofficial "outfitting" -- many rural land owners are tempting to allow use of land for hunting through informal "gifts". Not a good reason for trespass laws!! 7. Fire risks --- very little evidence. Snowmobiles and hunters start very few fires! 8. Taxation --- if rural property, farm residences, agricultural land were taxed at the urban rate x full assessed value, including school taxes, sufficient money would be available for policing, education for all, security, wildlife management. Why don't you tell all citizens that farm residences or not taxed?</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Any land surrounded by a fence or posted</p>	<p>Written permission is fair for entry</p>	<p>No it would not, rural folks don't go around to find the best back yard for a bbq and the just plo down and use it when they find it. Why should it be permissible to hunt or snowmobile or quad on others property? It is only fair to have permission or even a fee</p>
<p>i don't have a problem with the ask for permission.. I already do anyways..there should be better access to up to date rm maps either online or make the farmer post his land with a name and number to call</p>			
<p>No it should not be it is hard enough the way everything is being posted to get on land these days</p>	<p>Should be treated the same as long as there are no cows on the land at the time</p>		<p>Very unreasonable if you don't want anyone going on your land post it it would not be fair to us farmers either with someone knocking on their doors every 20 minutes I bought a farm to get away from people</p>
<p>No I don't think it should change, if land owners want people/hunters to get permission they should post there land if they don't care leave leave it in posted it's up to the land owners to regulate this in my opinion.</p>	<p>All land should be the same. Unless there is livestock</p>	<p>Permission could be a written not but also as long as owner knows who it is and can vouch that permission was granted thaYa fine</p>	<p>Yes I think that would be a bad idea no one will Go get permission to sled across a feild( for example)</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>all treated the same</p>	<p>visiting landowners in person and ask them permission to access their land</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Yes. Persons should be required to have written permission prior to entering private land</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Contact information should be available at municipal offices.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Treated the same</p>	<p>Unsure</p>	<p>Only if police where out giving tickets just to fill quotas</p>
<p>I think they need written permission to cross in to our lands no letter no go. \$2000 fine is perfect our neighbours can't see. To get it though there thick heads dont drive over the hay land even when its posted no trespassing no hunting.</p>			

Yes. This makes it clear to everyone and may make landowners less hesitant to testify when a trial is necessary.	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. This would remove the confusion and ambiguity between cultivated and native land.	Requiring the individual seeking access to seek permission by attending at any on site inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point would allow individuals in the field to seek permission without startling the landowner. Posting email addresses would allow individuals seeking permission to contact vacant landowners. Maybe it could be coordinated that municipal offices maintain a registry of who has permission on what land. Permission should be written.	No. This makes it clear that permission is a requirement. Complaints aren't made unless the trespasser does damage of some kind.
No, we have too much private land, with too much discrepancy, as to occupants, and owners. Driving on trails and roads only could be expanded to more zones, and Enforced harder. This would alleviate many land Owner Concerns	Cultivated land, with standing crop, should be treated the same as gated pasture. Open Gates, and land with no active operation could be treated differently	Many landowners live Hundreds of miles away from land they own. Email correspondence could be an inconvenience, leading to landowners denying permission for no other reason. I think Verbal permission should be sufficient	As a snowmobiler and hunter it would absolutely ruin both sports for me. The south half of the province is very vast. we have lots of great country, but it is spread over many 100s of km, and thousands of landowners.
I think the land should be posted no trespassing or else one should be allowed to cross so long as no damage to the property occurs.	It should be different.	Currently finding who to get permission from is not easy.	Yes, I feel that snowmobiles driving across a field does not cause any damage. I understand that a landowner has the right to refuse access to anyone but they should post the land if they don't want anyone to go on it.
Yes	All the same	Ask land owner	No sure
No	All land should be treated the same	Verbal or written as long as the land owner verified the permission if questioned by authorities	Yes, snowmobiling for example would become next to impossible
NO	All non posted land treated the same. I the owner doesn't want you on it they can post it	It is very difficult to find out who the owner is and where they live. A lot of the land is owned by corporations so RM maps are useless.	It will kill a lot of recreation such as hunting and snow mobiling
Sounds like a waste of good funds and time leave it alone	should be treated as the same	Go talk to the dwelling if not home then no hunting simple and ethical	I believe that only posted land should need to have consent prior to accessing
No, land should be posted if the owner wants to be asked.	Signage should be what differentiates accessible land from land the owner wants to keep private or be asked for permission. If there's a fence it's even easier to post signs.	If the owner wishes to make their contact information available they should do it. If land is posted and there is no way to find contact information then the land should be considered private.	Yes it would very negatively impact my ability to take my son hunting. We don't know anyone with land and have always when possible asked permission. If land is posted we always respect it and never leave gates open, ruts in fields or trash behind. The penalties for breaking rules and damage should be stiffer so we can keep open access and not punish respectful hunters.
No	No it should not be treated the same. If it is open(not fenced) than it should be accessible to hunters and other outdoor activities. If it is posted that will stop good honest hunters. People that dont follow the laws won't care about these new rules and legislation. Only deters good honest people.	Verbally to me is enough. But, you will always have liars, so IF, land is posted you should need written.	Absolutely it would. If you can't find a land owner or if they are unwilling to even talk to you, your done before it starts. This is a HUGE impediment on recreational use.
Yes	No	In person or by phone...phone numbers should be posted on signs.	
Yes	No	In person or by phone...phone number should be on signs	No
Yes			
Yes	Same	Phone call	No
Yes	Treated the same	Face to face or phone	No
Yes	All the same	Call or in person	No. Permission can be easily obtained in most cases by a quick call or visit. For example we have many hunters from US right now that have no trouble following this procedure.

Yes but it should be made easier to find out who owns what land and or who the renter is if it's up to renter to give permission or just the land owner.	Should all be treated the same regardless of what is happening on said land and how the boundaries are.	Should be granted in written form and carried at all times. For each individual or everyone in said parties at any given time.	No it wouldn't as it would decrease the people to go after for damages or poaching as they should have a list of who has permission to be on said land. Also it will give an idea if something happens they have people to go to to see if they have seen anything suspicious in the area.
How arbitrary do you want this? I don't suppose the commission wants to host a few pages worth of websites to indicate how each land owner feels about having visitors on their land. Have some contact information. It's 2018, having to visit the RM office to find contact info for a land owner is awfully backwards especially in our hyper connected society.	There should be a distinction, again, all land should be posted on the internet with a database of owners and their contact information as well as their land usage and feelings about visitors.	Call, text or email with critical information exchanged: when, where, how long, the purpose of the visit. Etc etc.	Any trip requires smart planning, why would you take a chance in your plan without consulting the owners of the land you plan to traverse.
Yes	Treat it all the same	Written	No
Yes they should .	All land for agriculture purposes should be treated the same .	Yes any individual should seek access permission by asking the owner directly by attending on any site inhabited residence by the most direct route from the main access point . No one should trespass on privately owned land without permission.	No it wouldn't no individual should be doing recreational activities on private property without permission.
No. Post what you don't want people on. I do.	Fenced should all be permission only.	In person.	The government will lose hunting revenue. And youth hunters. There will be people buying permission to hunt prime land. This turns it into a rich persons sport. It raises the cost to all hunters.
yes	all lands should be treated the SAME	by obtaining written permission in advance	no
Yes for sure, and it should be written permission.	All land, if it is owned by someone, should be treated the same..you needed written permission!	RMs should have landowners phone number so the hunter can contact the landowner and make arrangements to get written permission.	No, if someone owns the land you must get permission no matter what your activity. IT'S NOT YOUR LAND!
yes	No	Having email addresses posted at RM offices or visiting homestead	Yes
Yes!	They should all be treated the same.		So what if it does, one person's fun shouldn't be at the expense of another persons land or property
Yes. It is my property not public property and permission should be obtained	All land should be treated the same	All permission should be asked for and granted for all trespassing	My land my permission
Yes. No person should have the right to enter or cross onto another persons property. Would if the property owner was planning a hunting trip and wanted to site in his gun, and someone crossed through the path of the bullet?? Then what? Whose fault? Or would if the kids on the farm property were playing where the parents (owners of the land)thought the kids are safe, then alongcomes city folks out walking their huge dogs ( and had taken them off leash, thinking that in the country they can just run) and attacks the Kids and probably their farm dog as well.	All land treated the same. Stay off others property. And now because of so many abandoned building sites, I'm certain there are many old wells that were dug many years ago. And many farm sites had several large bore wells dig. One for the house and two for the barn. Very dangerous and possibly the new farmer does not know where these wells are situated.	Easy. Go into the rm office and asked who owns the property you want access too. Then go see that person and ask. And most times this land owner knows the adjoining land owner and where they live	When does the recreation of some overrule the livelihoods of the property owner. This is a dumb question. It's like your wanting to provide fun to some and take away the property owners right to make a living.
No		Phone or email.	Yes
Yes	All treated the same.	Need to talk to the owner.	No.
no it should not. i understand property owners concern and having family property ourselves. This law change will not affect people currently breaking the law all ready by damaging land and property. there should be some changes to hunting rules like no driving on property during bird season and driving on land to retrieve big game only. i think that would cut down on alot of the unwanted property damage. I also think that the punishment for breaking the current laws should be increased dramatically as well. that is truly the only way to decrease crime on rural property because people that break the current laws are going to break the new laws unless it is very punitive if you get caught. The other reason for not changing the law is it is unenforceable. There simply isnt enough resources to police this properly or if there was maybe the current laws would be sufficient.	yes should be treated the same	if land is posted it is posted. I agree that there should be an easier way to contact land owners weather through and app or signage with phone numbers etc.	Yes i think this will have a huge impact on the hunting community. I can see this turning into the usa where it becomes a pay to play. As it is prime hunting locations are becoming more scarce, with land owners posting it and only allowing friends on it (This is fine it is there right) but will be detrimental if this is the law. If this law change is put into affect it will also have a huge affect on public hunting lands. They will be overhunted, they are already overhunted. There are also other considerations that come into play ex wounded animals traveling to land that you wouldnt have permission on.

Yes you should have to get permission before going on anyone's land. It's private property .	Absolutey not it's private property.	Contact land owner. They can spend all kinds of money on quads, hunting gear etc. But can not spend \$5.00 on a RM map to fined out who land owner is.	No it's private land.
Yes, rural properties are private property and therefor consent from land owners should be given before any activity is to partake on the land.	All land should be treated the same way	Email addresses or telephone numbers of property owners could be available through municipal offices	
Given that it is extremely difficult to find out who owns a particular piece of Rural property ,And many land owners prevent lawful access to road allowances and waterways If the land is unoccupied and not fenced or signed, public should be allowed access	there should be a distinction	permission should be in writing if required	Yes it would it is hard enough with Rural landowners thinking road allowances are theirs and fencing off without even a gate and denying access to lakes for fishing and hunting , finding out who owns which parcel of land to go and seek permission
Yes	All land should be treated the same	Should be by written consent of land owner or renter. In this day and age it is not that difficult to find the contact information of people	No I don't feel it does. The lack of respect shown towards land by recreational users is getting out of hand.
Yes, prior permission should always be sought	No, it is all private property	Emsil or telephone numbers of land owners could be available through municipal offices	No, it is still private property and for the safety of those wanting to go on the land consent must be given prior to activity
Yes	No	Phone call	Yes
Yes. It's a constant battle keeping irresponsible people off land. Truck hunting will drop significantly and real sport man hunting will be completely unaffected	All the same	Written and signed with a timeline that expires every year	Not at all. Just the idiot's
No. I like the current rules that prohibit access if the land is posted. I am a rural landowner but I am also a city dweller and the main reason I believe this should continue is so that members of the public can have the opportunity for enhanced interaction with nature. It is wonderful that photographers, people interested in archaeology or wildlife, or geology, should be able to stop on the side of the road and respectfully explore our countryside. Some landowners, like myself, are happy to share this nature with respectful members of the public. And in locations where I am not comfortable with people being able to access my land, I have posted such sites with no hunting and no trespassing signs, which I have intended to apply also to people operating recreational vehicles.	I can understand if a distinction would be made to prohibit access to land that is under cultivation. I would not agree with restricting access to any land that is fenced. Land that is fenced is extremely easy for the landowner to post. I can understand landowners concern with strangers opening their gates. In such situations where a land owner is concerned about this I believe they should post. The reason I think this is because pasture contains some of our most beautiful native landscapes, hunting grounds, archaeology, and geology. It also contains more opportunity to view wildlife or to undertake hunting. I believe that there are many landowners with fenced pasture that do not mind respectful public entering the land. Such as myself. It happens rarely anyway - and if it is happening frequently, or if I am not comfortable with it on a specific location - I have posted.	Enhanced access to landowners through municipal offices or the most direct route to the nearest residence, sounds OK. (For cultivated land only) - pasture and fenced pasture that is not posted should not require permission in my opinion.	Yes.
Yes express permission should be required for the safety and security of all involved.	All land for ag purposes should be treated the same.	Written permission through email or text would be the preferred method for access. This ensures there is definitive proof that those wishing to gain access actually have permission. That being said, if a person were to seek permission at a residence on the property by the most direct route from the main access point, this could suffice as well.	most people who are conscientious will seek to ask permission and these are the people who landowners rarely have issues with. This may deter some of the "weekend warriors" from participating in any of these activities, but unfortunately this is the group that tends to be the most destructive and give others a bad name. Going to this route should increase the safety factor for all involved.
yes	all land treated the same	Permission should be sought in person and then given written consent	No
yes	yes should be a distinction	for hunting permission should be sought and granted by a few choices. By approaching the residence and asking or Email, phoning and give names and vehicle description of who will be on there land. And let owner know what hunting and with what type of weapon.	I think requiring permission will protect everyone from any personal or property damage between both parties. It may stop on how many people will participate in recreational activities.But, the people that care and want to participate will take the time and follow the rules which most of those people already do,.

Yes	All land should be treated the same.	Permission info at municipal offices	No
Absolutely!!!	Absolutely yes. An owner of virgin prairie is still THE OWNER. NO ONE should enter land that belongs to another. Damage done on such property can be irreversible!!!!	By TELEPHONE.	NO! All recreational activities run under government auspices have rules which must be abided by (e.g. fishing, boating, park access). Why should owners of private property have to suffer under the fact that some people's sense of entitlement tells them that they have free and easy access to land that does not belong to them. Furthermore, farmers are not asking for financial benefit from access, simply control over, and respect for, their private land.
Yes	No distinction	Signature. Similar to a manifest book	No
I agree that all members of the public, whether they be fellow farmers or people from the city, require prior permission. I own a half section [REDACTED] and have had the neighbours drive through like mad men on our property. When we ask them to not drive through the middle of our property (right near our house), they get extremely agitated. Furthermore, when we ask them to please call or text permission as we sometimes have patients out on our property, the individuals tell us no. I'm also very concerned about hunting. This past elk season (which as of sept 28 (today) is still on), we have had numerous people cutting our fence and driving through our property. Not only that, but we had a group of 8 hunters walking through our property with guns loaded. I am not against hunting at all, however there seems to be no issue at all with people trespassing and thinking that rural land is anyones land. My wife and I are avid outdoor enthusiasts and bought the property as our home to explore. However now with the people trespassing all the time (winter is bad for snowmobilers), we do not feel comfortable. We would thoroughly welcome new and tougher legislation for trespassers.	I think that ANY land that is privately owned should be treated the same.	Permission should only be granted in written form from the land owner. Posting of emails through a municipal office would be a huge breach of confidentiality. My wife and I are both in health care and would not appreciate our private information being posted publicly.	Making consent an express requirement may make it slightly tougher for recreational activities, however people should respect land owners and gain permission prior. Permission is very important and people may be out on their own private land and unknown to them other atv's, hunter and recreationalists may be out and come into contact with the land owner (mishap in hunting thinking it was a deer, driving fast on an atv on a private road, etc.)
no, Saskatchewan has vast areas of land and it is not always obvious where property lines begin and end, land changes owners and leases on a regular basis, education would help, many land owners are farming road allowances that could be used for accessing certain areas.	there are differences in each kind of land so define restrictions	seeking permission has become increasingly difficult, land lines are abandoned for cell phones which do not have numbers posted for public access, do owners wish to be bothered in some circumstances, like while on vacation. If it is important to restrict access post the land with contact info.	Growing up in Saskatchewan may have spoiled me in some ways, the rights and freedoms we enjoy are engrained in rural culture, I realize that land owners have a reasonable right to privacy on their land but snowmobiling miles from any residence and knowing where the boundaries are? Unreasonable.
Yes...and if people are caught without permission a fine should be levied	Yes	Find the landowner and ask	No
no.	The premise of the question is unclear. I assume that you are asking if all these categories of land should be equally considered within a future trespass law? The starting point is whether or not the Crown has total control of lands under question in the first place. Questions of land title categories or use categories are secondary to the primary questions of treaty interpretation.	The first step is to resolve any questions with respect to treaty and the initial land acquisition by the Crown, including all parties interpretation of such agreements, and not solely through common law interpretation.	Again, I reject the premise of your question. Consent by way of the land titles office saying that a person has ownership is irrelevant when questions of how the authority of the land titles office is granted in the first place. A pile of papers (digital or otherwise) are not the primary source of authority to own land.
no. if the land isn't posted no prior permission should have to take place. its simple. if you dont want people on your land post it end of story	all land should be treated the same if it posted stay off unless you have owners consent, or it's open to everyone equally	if the land is posted one need write consent and if not posted no consent is needed	yes it would.
yes	It should all be treated the same.	Permission should be sought by telephone if you know the person, or by knocking on the house door and asking if you do not know the person.	No.

No. Crown and deeded land also needs to be treated differently. Owners of private land should have right to post but this should come with conditions. Those who lease crown land should NOT be able to post the land, except when livestock are present. This land belongs to everyone. The leasees should also be taking care of this land and not over grazing and degrading its wildlife capacity and value in the future.	The categories should be privately owned land vs land owned by the government. If the land is cultivated or is fenced should not determine access.	When land is privately owned this should be up to the landowner HOWEVER ethical hunters will seek permission in most cases. To ensure this is an efficient process for both sides there should be a better way to contact the landowner. For land that belongs to the people of Saskatchewan, access should be open unless livestock are present.	Yes
I strongly agree.	It should all be the same	email through municipal office phone to make an appointment to get written permission letter through the post office to get written permission	No, it is not an impediment. there is a network of snowmobile trails that can be accessed. atv ers can use trails in provincial parks or forests . I believe obtaining consent also allows dialogue between the land owner and recreationalists about dangers, ie old fences . rock piles bears.
I believe it is best practice to always get permission when hunting but if the land is not posted it is free to travel on with some common sense factors I.E don't go across a farmers crop with a vehicle	All land should be treated the same if the owner doesn't want you in there put up signs like everyone else. Leave gates and fences as you found them	A better up keep on R.M maps and make them more readily available. With proper use and up to date R.M you should be able to contact the land owner	It would completely wreck any recreational activity in one form or another ATVs and snowmobiles would be confined to public ditches and road allowances that making the activities more dangerous for the rider and the community. As for hunting most people should be getting permission anyway but as an unwritten rule if it isn't posted with proper legible signs the its free access.
No.	All should be treated the same, this is not Alberta	Land should have a number to call to receive access	
No as long as I am on foot what am I hurting. Changing laws is not going to stop the people that are up to no good they are going to do regardless of the outcome. All this does is hurt the people that enjoy the outdoors. And will for generations to come.	No. What's wrong with posting the land I'm fine with staying out of it's posted. Even standing crop I stay clear of. Laws don't change ethics and morals.	Permission is so hard to find land owners now with big farm corporations. If it was made the people that I really would like to see is the ones that post there land with permission only and at least have a contact number to find them. I know farmers that have sections of land but don't live anywhere near it just farm it. If it's posted it needs to be written or via text with a contact number but if it's not posted foot access only unless written permission is given	It would. It's all about time. I love hunting but the window isn't very big. When I walk I go an average 5-10 miles a day in my boots. That's where this is going to hurt. I was taught to hunt this way and my kids are taught to hunt this way. As far as atv, and snowmachines the people that follows the rules will go away but if they want to drive across that field this trespass law isn't going to stop them.
No	All property should be treated the same	If land is posted permission should be required. If land is not posted the implied consent should be the rule and the landowner can retain the right to require anyone to leave their property if and when they decide to revoke said consent	Yes. If a landowner wishes to revoke consent it can expressed in person even with posted signs. To find every landowner and ask for permission would be an arduous task and would severely restrict recreational activity.
I do not think so. However be abusing the access should be treated more harshly. Post the land and signs should be provided free of charge.	Absolutely there should be and people that are educated in Sask and respectful adhere to those stipulations already. Individuals that do not know the difference should not be hunting. There are people out there hunting that cannot speak English, How do they get licenses and how are they expected to know proper etiquette. On another note, I have noticed a lot of these govt pastures are being chained and locked so we cannot access them either for most of the year. So pretty soon you will only be able to drive and hunt down grid road and in the ditch. Wow are you folks serious about this.	It would certainly help if the information to request information was readily available and easily accessible, Maybe on the hunter app. Other wise if it is too much of a pain to get permission I would rather run the risk of a farmer if I access unfenced or unposted land.	Absolutely, if you implement laws that cannot be enforced you will have serious problems and land owners will end up in serious conflict as they will be the ones engaged. Crazy idea to try and implement.
Yes	All land treated the same		No, skidoo clubs already have tobhVe consent forms for trails

Yes, absolutely.	They should all be treated the same.	Finding out who owns the land with RM maps and contact either by phone or in person (on the homestead).	In regards to rural activities (ATV's, snowmobiles, etc), if permission is not granted for access there are other options. For example, rural back roads and ditches. So in short, NO, making consent a requirement in all circumstances does not pose an unreasonable impediment to rec activities.
No I don't feel that there is a need for this change	All treated the same	Most direct, phone or in person	Impediment no question
Yes	All land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same.	an individual seeking access be required to first seek permission by attending at any on site inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point	No
Yes	No distinction	In person at inhabited residence by way of municipal roadway or maintained lane	No
Yes	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	Yes by verbal or written	No
YES!!!	All land should be treated the same	Permission should be sought via email, or phone.	No. Anyone who wants access to private property for legitimate activities should not have an issue with requesting permission.
Yes, this is private property.	Yes, all land should be treated the same. All is private property. It is a lot of work posting signs which can easily be removed by people who wish to trespass.	Through the municipal office. Who has to go driving across the land to get to the homestead to ask permission? The question itself indicates a problem. Gates are left open, fences get cut etc.	No it does not. The laws been ignored over and over again. Teaching need to be done just like with seatbelts and helmets. Obeying the law is not an unreasonable impediment.
no. I agree one should respect landowners and seek permission. However, If the landowners really don't want anyone on their land or wants to know who is on it, they will post it.	treated the same	In person or by phone. Email doesn't work, often permission is needed within hrs or a day. There needs to be a huge improvement in access to Landowners/renters of land, contact information. Landowners contact information needs to be on the RM Maps. Many owners are just running cell numbers not land lines so the general public don't have access to those numbers. Numerous parcels of land are identified as corporate farms, again the general public don't know who or how to contact. I have had instances when the locals are not even sure who the contact person would be, and the contact person turned out to be local. There are also instances when the owner is from out of province but the renter is local, but very hard to track done permission as nobody is sure who is renting. It can be hard to track down the owner because he might not live on a farm but in a nearby town but that is hard because there are so many small towns in Saskatchewan. The other problem that is of concern, RM maps are only available in each respective RM. These maps should be made available from ISC. It is hard to find what the RM boundaries are and where the RM office is. In short if the laws are going to change there needs to be better RM Maps, with complete and proper contact information and easier availability of RM Maps.	yes. It will make some activities very hard to do. If there is better contact information it would help. Under the current system of mapping there will be much frustration for all sides involved. It is currently frustrating for the general public
Yes .A farmer should have the right to know who is on their land and for what purpose.It is lawfully their land that they have purchased and pay taxes on.	All land that someone has purchased and pays taxes on should be included.	Pick up a R. M. Map .Ask at R.M. Office who owns the land and how they may be contacted,then phone or visit the person to ask for permission.	Absolutely not.Make situations more safe if you know someone is on your property and what they are doing there.
Yes	All should be treated the same	Contact through phone or face to face at property the RM office could give contact info	Recreational activities should not be allowed on private lands without express permissions from owner Owners should know who and what activities are being done on their property in.case of resulting damage or if permission is granted to warn of dangers present on the property.
I dont belive so ...the current system of posted land requires permission has been a grassroots part of fundamental freedom in this province for generations	There are too many rules already enforce the laws we have and deal with criminals differently than land use for lawful purpose	Verbal or written or unposted land means access approved automatically	Absolutely it would kill the spirit of generations of history in our province

NO	Yes there should be separate regulations for certain lands. How on earth can you contact a landowner if you dont have his/her contact information from the rm map or it is a Sask 100010101 corporation on the map.	Land owners could notify the RM their wishes with their land. ie) They want their land marked on the RM map no hunting (color it red on map and provide phone number on map.) If the land owner elects that they dont care- They can have their land colored white on the map. Eitherway you will have to make corporations (Sask 101010101920, or carlton cattle co. ) provide contact information as well. This is going to cause the govt more work than it is bargaining for. Right now the onus is on the landowner to prominently post their land. You guys are going to be the ones having to mediate now.	This will effectively kill the hunting industry in the south. You are opening the door for illegal outfitting, and paid access issues. There is already an entitled attitude among landowners that they own the deer/moose that are on their land and they are saving them for themselves. (I am a landowner, i post my land hunting with permission and provide a phone number) How hard is it to post your land. Guys complain that they have to spend \$20 a year to post their 10 quarters of land---In perspective that 10 quarters is valued at over 1 million dollars and they are complaining about \$20 bucks. The tax write offs farmers get already are astonishing. perhaps the govt can subsidize no hunting signs for them.....but then they would complain that they have to put up free signs. Land will be tied up by the highest bidder. Just look to the states. They need to pay for hunting leases to get access to land. Essentially you are making it so only the rich can play. Perhaps landowners that deny hunters should no longer receive crop insurance, wildlife damage compensation, etc
Yes it is a joke that this is not implemented already	All land used for agricultural purposes should fall under the same regulations for trespassing, it's private property	Verbal and/or written permission as per land owner discretion	No, as stated earlier, it's private property. One should be required to have permission before entering any kind of Private property
Yes	Yes	In person by writing or electronically by text or email	No
No	Yes	In person	Yes
NO .Land should be posted to prevent access. As a cabin owner the only time I will consider access as a problem is when there is a problem. WHEN THAT OCCURS the LAND WILL BE POSTED and the posting will be removed when the problem subsides.I don't want my neighbors to have to ask for permission to cross my land when they go for a snowmobile or quad ride.	a and c are great but b is problematic we have land on the river many use the river for recreation and come on shore to fish lunch rest etc..If it is a problem then the land can be posted.	A phone number--e-mail address-physical address (if accessible) Better to put up a sign inviting people to use but don't abuse and if abuse takes place then to report and have the current laws applied.	Yes Yes Yes .My families land is accessible to all until abuse takes place and then it is posted until the abuse quits.
In my opinion the current trespass rules that are in place should not be changed for hunters and anglers. If a land owner doesn't want hunters or anglers on their property or simply want to know who is on their land, they should post their land. If it is posted hunting with permission only they should leave a contact number or location where they can be reached. Simply posting the land and not being reachable is unfair and unethical. Plain and simple if its posted you need to ask for permission. If it's not posted its open for hunting and fishing access. In many cases landowners are busy working, enjoying family time, out of town or impossible to reach. Also much of the land is now owned by investors and farming corporations and there may be miles between occupied houses to talk with someone who may or may not own the land or even know the owners. While some landowners thank you for asking permission to hunt some birds or deer, others get angry for you wasting their time while they are busy. Others will respond that well if it isn't posted why are you asking? Some don't want to be disturbed early in the morning, later in the evening or on a day of rest for them (which may not always be a Sunday) and if they are disturbed they can be miserable when contacted and flat out refuse access even though they may have granted the same permission had they been contacted at a different time. Like many of us in society these landowners are overwhelmed with telemarketers, scammers and sales people constantly phoning and harassing them. Hence they often refuse to answer their phones to unknown numbers or even answer their doors if they don't recognize a face or vehicle that has pulled into their yard. Thus causing frustration for both parties. For hunting, access to land should not require advance permission of the land. The reason for this is that wild animals will move from one area to another and may be on any given parcel of land at any time and can/will move to other areas on a regular basis. For example, a flock of partridges could roost in a hedge row of trees a small creek bottom or a slough bottom and walk or fly to a number of different fields to feed in and all of the various areas are owned by different landowners. Figuring out who to contact in advance could prove very time consuming for the hunter and all the various landowners. Vehicle access such as lifted trucks, snow mobiles and ATV's can potentially cause issues to landowners as that muddy field may have just been seeded and doesn't need to be ripped up or rutted up. Also load vehicles may scare livestock. As a result, these types of users should ask for permission to ensure they don't cause damage.	All land should be treated the same, unless there are occupied building or livestock on the property. In such cases permission should be required as there is a mandatory wildlife law that states hunting cannot take place within 500 metres of a building, stockade or corral occupied by people or livestock without the consent of the owner or occupant in charge.	If land is not posted hunters should be able to access the land without having to ask for permission. (It is open as the landowner doesn't want to deal with people asking for permission) In cases where land is posted, there should be contact information for the landowner and then the permission should be granted. In my books a verbal permission should be fine. Written permission would be great if questioned by a third party or if a land owner changed his mind...however, having landowners write up permission slips seems like a lot of work that most wouldn't want to do if busy harvesting or working the land in advance of inclement weather.	Yes, it would. Often a person only has a limited time to be afield, be it due to restricted time off work, family commitments or financial limitations. If much of that valued time is spent trying to track down landowners, being turned down or grumbled at for wasting a landowners time, it will cause great impediment to the recreational activity which in turn will result in less people participating, loss of hunting licence revenues along with declines in tax revenues from the sale of fuel, food and hunting accessory sales.
Yes	No. All land regardless of land use should be seen as private and no entry permitted without consent	In person , either at the owners residence or by phone call. Written permission would be best with information of number in the party and their names and addresses.	No. If people have time for recreational activities they can make the time to arrange for adequate permission

Yes	Yes	By talking to the landowner in person or by phone before going onto any land.	No. These people who would go onto rural land would not do this on people's land in urban areas. Snowmobiles, ATVs-era may use road ditches or land that has been set aside for that purpose. Hunters can obtain permission from landowners to hunt. The good ones do that now. I regret that this seems harsh but the bad eggs out there have wrecked it for everyone.
Absolutely not.	Treated the same	Permission should only be required if the land is posted. If the owner wishes to potentially grant permission, they can indicate on the sign how they can be contacted.	It would end hunting as we know it. Hunting is already declining. It would have a devastating effect on my favourite passtime with my son and it would have a huge negative economic effect.
requires permission	treated the same	keep info at R. M. offices cell phone ,phone if you your info in there put it on paper	should not have to be ,some northern land owners don't care if it does
Yes	All land treated the same.	Telephone number posted on each quarter of land on the RM maps available at RM office.	No it would not.
Yes	All land should be the same .	A form of written permission	No
Yes, access should only be allowed with the express permission of the land owner or occupier	All land should require permission of landowner.	Should require that individuals seeking permission must attend at any on-site inhabited residence by most direct route from established municipal roadway. Individuals seeking permission may obtain a copy of the RM map from the RM office, this should provide sufficient information in most cases to seek permission. Oppose posting of email address or enhance info from municipal offices for privacy reasons.	No, the individual does not have a right to access and so this is not an unreasonable impediment.
yes	yes all the same	written permission only	all the same NO trespassing is NO trespassing for everyone
Yes permission should be obtained and approved by land owner or land leases who is making the dad to dat decisions on such land	All private land should be considered private and treated the same	Written permission	Not at all
No	Same	Whatever way in order to contact owner. People travelling up someones driveway for permission should be exempt from trespassing unless the landowner has a sign stating no trespass with contact info, on the driveway.	It would for snowmobiling in some areas. Not for hunting
yes	all treated the same	face to face	no
Yes	They should be treated the same	Approach homestead via most direct route	No
yes it is my land and i do not want anyone on it without my permission. you dont want people on your lawn or garden without your permission...why would i want people on my land without my consent??? The consent should be in writing or text message; it should come from the land owner and not my 2nd cousin as some hunters have done in the past. The form/consent should state to whom the consent is given, for how long and for what activities	ALL land should be treated the same irregardless of how the owner is using it pasture, cultivation, fallow.; whether it is agriculture or not. it should not have to be fenced or boundaries put up or gate installed ( too expensive) to dissuade or prevent someone from entering. Point being it is MY land not yours...go buy your own land!!!	I will not publicly give out my email address...so it can be sold or given to scammers. Am leery about the phone number as well. Anyone in our area knows where we live and how to find us to get permission. How about setting up a website on the sask gov page and with the tax notices sent out every year the land owner can indicate what their status is for access; ie yes to hunting but no to quads-snow mobiles etc. set up a mobile app so people can check, or go into the rm office. the onus should be on the person seeking access to lands to find out what the permission status of the land is, the app/map could be on the same page as the HAL accounts are or on a central sask gov website	NO it is my land what gives you the notion that you can just access it anytime you want to. I pay the taxes, I fix the fences that get cut by hunters ski-doers, i have to fix the ruts left by ATV & quads. i have to pick up the broken glass and cans left by partyers. NO means NO access!!! If people want to go enjoy activities in the outdoors go to a park, crown land, a place that allows such activity or go buy your own land!!!! Also i should not be able to be sued by these trespassers (idiots) on my land if they get hurt tripping on a downed log, hitting a rock pile or ravine, or a piece of machinery left out in the field!!!! with the new marijuana laws i dont need a bunch of stoners trying to stash their plants on my property either

Yes.	Treat them all the same	Any method. In person, phone, text, email. As long as they try to find the owner or renter and get permission first.	I do not think it would be unreasonable or impediment to recreational activities.
No, if they are crossing for recreational purposes, yes otherwise.	Same		Yes, I believe it would be too hard to manage. I feel it would impact recreational activities in a negative manner, hurting local economies.
Yes	Yes. All agricultural land should be treated the same whether fenced, posted or open	Attend residence to seek permission by direct route. Contact information may be made available through RM office with owners permission - not for public record.	No. All persons should respect privately owned property. Permission should be sort and given before entering privately owned property. If permission not obtained individual/s are trespassing.
Yes	All land be the same	Individuals who wish to hunt or enter property for any reason, should go to the local RM offices and ask if the particular land owner has put a notice on their property giving permissions to enter their land for such reasons. It should be the land owners responsibility to notify their RM office and put a "no trespass" posting on the map. I feel this would be the proper approach. I do not believe in hunting on my land and have many people each year come in my yard, get my dogs stirred up, ask to hunt and be rude and irate when we say no to their entering our land. This is unfair to us and I think the government should partner with the RMs and have this service. If the land owner does not register their land as a "no trespass" zone and someone asks if they can hunt there, then it should ok for entry. There are people that do allow people on their land and that is their decision and fine but for those that don't, it would be too costly to post every corner of their land and try to enforce it. Both farmers or land owners should have a responsibility as well and work with local governments	I know as a land owner you can't catch a snowmobile or atv ! Once they are flying through your field they are gone, however there could be a website snowmobiles or recreation vehicles could go to prior to their fun, showing routes. For example , as a land owner, I don't want hunting on my land, but snowmobiles I have no problem with. Atv's making ruts, yes I'd be upset. The local rm's could have a link page with a map, the farmer would have told the rm no to hunting, yes to snowmobiles, no to rv's, indicated on the map with green and red dots or whatever ? It's possible this couldn't be enforced but the main problem we have in our area is ATVs rutting our fields and irrational hunters.
Yes	All land treated the same	Written Text E mail Verbal - to be followed up with some Sort of written confirmation	Absolutely not, Plan your activities and plan to have permission for land that is to be utilized for the planned activities.
Prior Permission should be required if the land is posted but if it's not it would indicate the rural landowner would allow permission AFTER access but permission would still be required	Yes it is still privately owned. No different that a property privately owned anywhere Anyone has the opportunity to purchase at will. Just like the land owner	By the most direct route RM listings are appropriate resources	Land that no access is wanted should be posted. Anything unposted should be an indication that the land owner would have no objections. Respect should be promoted
yes unless there are extreme circumstances	all agricultural land should be treated the same	by direct contact with the landowner	it would require planning by the person involved in the activity
Yes	All should be treated the same when used for agriculture purposes.	People unknown to the owner should contact the municipal office. If they are known they should contact the owner by phone for access. We have people who drive in to the yard and pretend they are looking for made up names so they can have a look and see if there is opportunity for theft. Our property with buildings has a No Trespassing sign posted.	If you are growing crops for the next season that will be damaged by snowmobilers, atv-ers and recreationalists they should stay off. If this is not considered unreasonable then the growers should also be allowed to go to the city and sit in people's back yards. I have never considered not doing that as an unreasonable impediment to my enjoyment.
Yes	Yes	Permission through verbal or written consent ,land owners should be registard with rm office ie cell # email house phone	No
Yes	Someone owns and pays for that land no matter if fenced or signage.	Use main access to request permission	Permission must be required of a land owner. If owner says yes go ahead and a skidoo rider cuts his head off riding through barb wire fence, should they be sued???

No if they don't want people on it simply post, very simple	All treated the same	Shouldn't require permission unless posted	Yes as previously mentioned if you don't want people on post it. Too many landowners that don't live in area or out of province making it unreasonable to track them down
No	Distinction between, yes.	Permission should not be required. However...a phone call is sufficient. Especially in regards to hunting hours away from home and gaining permission before travelling.	Absolutely yes.
Yes	All land should be treated the same, regardless of how the owner of the land utilized it,	Seek permission by established roads to main access point	It's not unreasonable, if you want to cross someone's land seek out permission, most land owners in my area have no problem with snowmobiles crossing land on snow cover in the winter, but quads rutting up fields in the mud is far more damaging
Yes	Same	Written through municipal office	No.
No.if a land owner does not want you on there land then the onus should be on them to post there property in a proper and we'll identified way. I've tried to contact land owners for permission and it's almost an impossible task at times to be Vern find out and go owns some land let alone get contact info for them. I own land myself and it is posted properly with my phone number on it so people have the ability to contact me for permission	It should all be the same unless there is animals on the land or in a pasture. Again it should be up to the land owner to have it properly and legally posted and if it is not then anyone should be able to enter said property.	If it's new property that is leagaly posted the prior permission. If you can contact the landowner that is. If not properly posted no permission should be needed ! Ever ! Properly posted is proper signs on all 4 corners of any property and at all approaches and / or every 1/4 mile of the property line ! I see all these people who paint no hunting etc on old tires or cardboard and put them at one Conner if there property ! This is [REDACTED] and illegal.	If an animal is wounded on land you have permission to hunt and crosses to land where you could not get permission or find anyone to get permission.
YES	YES	Through anonymous means that allows landowners to respond to the request as they see fit. I wouldn't want strangers coming to my door or let the general public have access to contact information unless given by me.	Maybe. I don't really know as I don't partake in these activities therefore I don't understand all the implications. It seems to me that it would impede the way things are done now.
No	There should be a distinction. Open pasture is much different than cultivated land.	Landowners should post a method of contact if they are willing to allow access. Finding or getting ahold of landowners is almost impossible unless you personally know them.	Saskatchewan should register ATV's and put the money towards a trail system, the current method of insurance and access to places to ride is terrible.
No	Treated the same	Should only need permission if the land owner has there land posted with signs	Yes
yes	should all be treated the same	by contacting by phone	no
Yes. ALL MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC should include First Nations if it does not already.	Treated the same	Find out who the land owner is and get written permission or at least a text.	No responsible recreationers already ask
no	yes distinction	rm maps have phone numbers or sign posts have phone numbers or directions how to get a hold of land owners or operators	yes
Yes	Should be treated the same	Written or email permission from land owner with his name, signature, and number. Also a picture of the permission on your phone would work.	
No i dont believe so in all situations land that has been seeded or has standi g crop, livestock in pasture yes permission to access should be required, that being said i dont feel farmers want to be constantly harrassed for access to there land i feel if they want people to seek permission they would post it as they have seemed to do in my area if they felt the need and that seems to work well.	I think it should be conditional like mentioned if land has been seeded or standing crop, or occupied by live stock permission should be required, un occupied pasture or already harvested land should be accessible without permission unless obviously posted by owner	Many rural properties have no residents living there alot of it us simply farn land not often easily known who owns it if rm had access to contact owner via email address or ph number that would be A option.	I think it would heavily impede rec snowmobiling ,hunting ect if permission is required on every field you may cross while snowmobiling for instance i think by requiring permission to livestock occupied land and seeded or standing crop land that would eliminate and concerns of most farmers ranchers

No. I feel that snowmobiling does not hurt the land. As for hunting I would love to see all the land posted with permission only and it be mandatory for the land owner to provide contact info on all signs posted on the land. It will be easier for people to find out who to contact for permission.	Should be all the same. Once again post your contact info so people can obtain permission easily.	Like I dated previously. Have a contact number on every sign on the property. If access is granted you should have a signed paper/contract with said land owner. Which states for how long, land locations you are able to access, and everyone's name that would be allowed to access the property. It is upto the land owner if they would like to meet with the people inquiring but if the said land owner has to meet with hundreds of people he may not want to physically meet with everyone.	Yes it will. I feel your going to see a lot more people getting out of hunting, snowmobiling, and atving. Also with that hunting is the best way for nature conservation. You will see a big drop in funds being given by hunters and unturned will be a rise in wildlife damage in crops/fences.
Yes. General public needs to be aware of any crop damage that may or may not occur as well as obstacles that may be present. Anyone choosing any form of recreational travel over private land should respect landowners right to protect their fields and crops.	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. General public quite often cannot distinguish between a seeded or unseeded field or what a certain piece of property is being used for.	Contacting the landowner. In our computer age, there are websites that make this process achievable. Verbal permission would be acceptable and responsible. During snowmobile rallies, this is already a common courtesy.	No. There are already numerous and sufficient public access areas available.
Yes absolutely, no exceptions.	All agricultural land should be treated the same.	Permission should be established directly between land owners/ lease holder and by person wanting access.	Not at all . Recreational vehicle can cause damage to environmental sensitive native prairie rangeland.
	I would think the same unless landowner has his fences open For access	This is the problem firstly who grants access landowner or renter plus as a hunter and farmland owner I can personally attest finding locating land owners is next to impossible maps out of date land owners phone numbers non existent privacy laws restricting RmS giving out any information even if they have correct numbers our land is in my mom's name she is not even in sask anymore no way to contact her I am 180 kms away I post land hunt on foot only as that's the way I hunt post your land if you don't want anyone hunting on it or post your contact number . If you restrict hunting you should also be exempted from any wildlife damage coverage like Montana	Yes this is not a hunter access issue this lack of policing and enforcement issue for theft and vandalism I can personally attest of items stolen and RCMP do not attend in fact they do not consider policing their job theft and vandalism is not caused by hunters in fact I would guess theft and vandalism go down during hunting season Last year i covered over 1000 kms during hunting season i never saw a RCMP or a DNR. My job entails a lot of driving in the country up to 25000 kms per year I never see RCMP off the paved roads patrolling and I mean never
Access to all agricultural land should require consent from land owner or lease holder . No exceptions.	No exceptions all property should require the same consent process.	Directly contact the land owner or lease holder of any agricultural property. Access is granted based on trust , respect for land owner or lease holder.	Recreational vehicle can become a huge liability for land owner or lease holder. They also cause damage to environmentally sensitive native prairie rangeland .
Nope not unless posted, some farmers are cutting off access to wildlife for the public and using this as their personal hunting grounds while those wanting to participate are left in the cold.	Treated the same, why create even more confusion.	With a simple phone call or a knock on the door, verbal permission should be more than acceptable.	Absolutely
No unless land is posted			Yes
Revise but not this drastic .. All members of province including treaty and Metis as well !!! Other than outfitters leases and trapping leases (the occupier).. I disagree with the permission before entry to several angles animals enter and exit land as wish transferring diseases and evasives people would be very small contributor if any at all	All land the same except crown lease land ..	As often as possible but land owners need to use there discretion as well if it is a must keep out area .. post it no trespass	Yes . Or would cause burden on land owners being harassed for entry permission while busy with personal and professional life ..
No	No	Though direct means	Yes
Yes.	All land should be treated the same.	Free, online access to RM maps, with contact information for registered landowner would make the process much easier.	No, this is not unreasonable.
No	Same	Email, phone calls, face to face conversation.	Yes

No I don't think so , I think we have a good system now if it's posted you can't go on it if it's. It posted land owner obviously isn't concerned, I think that the proposed changes will be a huge headache for everyone involved	If it has crop on it that was not able to be harvested or livestock are winter grazing I believe access should require permission.	Over the phone, or in person which could be hard to do .	Yes
Yes	Yes	In writing	No
No most farmers will just end up annoyed by 30 different people a day bothering them to go in their fields			
No	Should all be the same	Any	Most definitely
No	All land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same	There shouldn't be permission needed and if people have an issue with people on there land post it. If they just want to know who is on the land post it hunting with permission only and leave contact numbers on there signs.	If you make it that permission is required we will turn into the USA where the people with the biggest wallets get all the access to the best land. As much as people aren't legally allowed to pay people for access for hunting. It happens all the time. All sorts of "gifts". If they law changes it will be Devastating to hunting in saskatchewan
No. For many reasons this will do more harm then good. I come from a big family who all have our own farms/land. If we do not want public on our land we post it. If it's not posted I don't mind the public accessing my land. Don't get me wrong there is always that 1 guy that rips threw my crop but not everyone should be painted with the same brush. For hunting this will create people charging for access to land and that's not right.	Post your land if you don't want anyone on it.	Need phone numbers/email to contact all landowners and should be accessible at rms.we post our land with phone number on posting	100%. This would cause more poaching and disregard to farmers land.
I am a land owner in the ██████████ and an active outdoors person . I do not support the legislation that you are proposing as I think it will drive a deeper wedge between the rural and non rural population. I believe that everyone should be asking for permission to access private lands when it is possible but there are many times that you cannot even find the landowner or the person who leases the land. At times the owners do not even live in the province. In addition some of the large landowners do not want to be bothered with people coming to there property to get permission. I believe that the existing laws serve the purpose if they are enforced properly. There has to be some onus on rural land owners as well. If the land owner wants no trespassing then it should be posted as such. If he is not concerned then leave it open. In the last decade the provincial government has sold millions of acres of public lands that were accessible for outdoor activities. This land is now off limits for the public which further restricts access for activities such as hunting.	There has to be some recognition that the vast majority of people respect landowner rights. Those that don't will break the rules no matter what.These proposed new laws will only affect those that are responsible while the crooks will continue to do what they always do. Responsible people for example do not drive through grain fields, raid gardens or harass cattle. There bad people in every walk of life and and why does everyone have to pay the price. We just need to enforce the existing laws in a proactive manner. If land owners want to post there land or portions of there land it is there choice.	Should this proposed legislation come into effect there needs be a province wide directory created, listing phone numbers or contact information for landowners. Many people have given up there land lines in favor of cell phones and to my knowledge there is no easy way of finding cell phone numbers. In addition as I have mentioned before I know land owners that don't want there phone numbers given out so how do you get in touch. The onus should not all be on the person trying to get access. Even with the use of RM maps it is very difficult to get contact information. Some land holdings are shown as numbered companies and it is extremely difficult to find owners or lease holders. The provincial government and local business make a profit on the sale of hunting licenses. Making it more and more difficult to seek consent to hunt on private lands is only going to add frustration. It is very important to have a mechanism to reach land owners.	Yes to the above. See my previous comments. Without the proper and efficient means to contact rural landowners this will cause a lot of frustration for both parties.
No, too much land is owned by non residents who can't be reached Also, this would limit access to Wildlife which is public property	Any type of land where access needs to be controlled should be posted, any kind of rule or prescription for type of land would lead to confusion or misinterpretation	The landowner should post contact information on the property otherwise permission is not required	Yes, this would put Wildlife under the control of private land owners, the Ministry of Environment would no longer be effective in managing hunter harvest and eventually it would be more practical for hunters to buy hunting rights from the landowner rather than a license from the government. This is in practice in other countries like Africa where game is now sold to hunters by landowners.
No, not necessary in all cases,	A distinction should be made, unused land a great deal of distance from anywhere should not require permission	In person or a phone call, if land is posted with owner information people are more likely to acquire permission	Absolutely yes, I can tell access will be denied more often than granted
No	Yes	In person or by phone	Yes
No	Distinction	Only needed if land is posted or enclosed by fence	Yes
No only on posted land	There should be a difference between fenced and non fenced land	All land owners should have to put their phone number so people can get ahold of them for access	Yes it would

No, I as a landowner in Southwest Saskatchewan, do not feel the need to require express consent prior to access. I have not had issues with people on my land without permission. Typically, someone who wants to hunt my ground already ask for permission.	Private land Should be treated the same regardless of land use.	By phone, in writing or in person. The method by which a person obtains permission is inconsequential.	Yes, currently landowners who do not wish the public to access their property have the right and ability to post no trespassing signs around the property. It is not the governments duty to make everyone's land off limits unless express prior consent is granted by the landowner. This legislation would create a very large increase in tax burden on the public with respect to the policing and enforcement of those people that are found guilty of imposed trespass laws.
I think getting permission from both owner and occupiers makes sense. There is too much of people doing what ever they want on land that's not theirs. They don't care about the damages they do/make and it is costly to owner/occupiers.	All land should be treated the same, if you do not own it get permission to be on it.	Face to face is the best way, and at the homestead. Tell the owner/occupiers your intentions and do as you say. That way when you want to be on their property/properties again they will more likely to say yes again.	No I don't think so, it would be a problem for the owner/occupiers if people are damaging their property/properties
Yes	All the same	Personal contact, prior to trespassing, by approaching the owner by way of owners roadway	No A person should consider the fact .....where can I use my recreational vehicles.....before buying such toy. The usage shouldn't be at the expense of a landowner.
No, I do not need 1000's of phone calls during hunting season. All I ask is you respect the hunt only on foot signs.	As I've said if you don't want trespassers on you're land, post it. The vast amount of people will respect you're wishes. We have posted our land for 30 years and not had any problems.	Buy the purchase of an RM map and permission given over the phone with the persons full name, address and phone number. This is less intrusive than a bunch of strangers coming into farm yards.	
NO. We already have laws in place for this. There are different ways for a landowner to post land if they do not want trespassing or hunting. If a hunter wants access to land it can be difficult to find the landowner or occupier. The landowner may not even live in the same province. I know this first hand from trying to find one myself. This type of a law will be a great detriment to the hunting community, and most hunters will likely just give up in vain. I'm sure the government will suffer greatly as well from this. If the vast majority give up it will be a huge reduction in licence sales draw fees, not to mention the economic spin off of other sales such as, hotels, restaurants, gas stations and stores with apparel and ammunition. It will most likely cause some smaller specialty business to close without hunters to purchase goods to keep them going. A lot of smaller communities rely on hunting operations to keep them going. With the record number of draw applicants in the last 2 years this must speak volumes in the amount of people interested in the sport of hunting. I myself have introduced this to my 2 daughters, and my youngest daughter will now get to fully experience hunting this year first hand for herself. She is excited to go out and hunt carry a firearm and hopefully harvest a deer. This is a time of year I myself get very excited for, not to be able to shoot an animal (although I do hope to), but to be able to spend time with my girls in the outdoors doing something all 3 of us enjoy.	No. All land should not be classified as the same. Cultivated or crop land is not something that most hunters would disturb. I can't see how anyone could harm pasture land unless they're driving recklessly, but if that is the case they are most likely to wreck a vehicle as well. I realize there are always exceptions, and in this case it is those exceptions that make a bad name for the rest of us. Not all hunters are bad. All the hunters I know are respectful of the lands they hunt on, because they enjoy the sport and want to continue to do so. If land is posted, then we move on. If there is crop, then we move on. If there is livestock, then we move on until we find an appropriate section of land to hunt. This new law will result in hunting be a sport for only a privileged few, such as the wealthy, or for people that know landowners or if they own land themselves. It baffles me as to why the government would like to take this away from people of Saskatchewan. This is a sport that a lot of people enjoy, lots of kids are involved with it. By having our younger generations getting involved and learning respect for land, firearms and landowners, and the animals we hunt makes them grow up to better, more responsible adults. Taking this away from them would be a huge injustice. I hope that the government will reconsider this and abandon the idea of implementing this new law.	I have had to seek landowner consent myself for hunting in certain zones. This is a difficult and arduous task. I first had to find the appropriate RM office, and then had to purchase a RM map. This is only a part of information needed. It does not contain any phone numbers so it is extremely difficult to get in touch with some of these landowners. If hunters are required to go door to door this is going to do a few things. 1. Landowners will get tired of answering the door to a continuous stream of strangers. 2. Hunters will get tired of being turned away and driving from farmhouse to farmhouse only to be turned down or to be told that they don't own that piece of land. That landowner lives about 80 miles north or they've moved to Alberta, or whatever the case. 3. Landowners will be charging a fee to hunt on their land, and this in turn will force the vast majority to put their firearms or archery equipment away and give up on the sport of hunting. Which will make it only accessible to a select few. This will make the landowners more profitable, but without the average blue collar worker and avid outdoor enthusiast to partake in such a great sport will result in a huge loss of revenue for the provincial government. Bottom line, don't change the laws. We already have laws and regulations in place that protect lands if the landowners choose to put up the appropriate signage.	Absolutely. As I've stated in previous comments it is difficult to find all the necessary land owners for the lands you want to access. The laws and regulations already exist for this. If landowners don't want public on their lands they have to post it in the manner they like.
No, the current legislation is sufficient. Given the difficulty to determine who owns the land due to outdated RM maps and tracts owned by parties that live out of province, gaining permission for non-posted land can be nearly impossible.	Land under active cultivation (standing crop) could be distinguished from fenced and unfenced property.	Verbal permission should be sufficient to grant access to land. Landowners could include contact information (ie: Phone number on gate sign) on posted land so that they could be contacted to obtain permission for access.	It can be difficult to find the owner of parcels to get permission. I have had issues with out of date RM Maps or property owned by out of province companies. There are also times where the land has changed hands due to death or sale since the RM Map was last published. Some of the RM offices will not give out contact information for the owners of the parcels, making the ability to seek permission difficult.
Yes should have permission required	Yes as the gates can be left open and animals let loose	Before the season starts	No then people know who is on the land
YES, out of respect for the rural property owner ALL Access by members of the public should request PRIOR permission of the rural landowner to access their land.	YES, All land for rural property and lands for agricultural purposes should be treated as trespassing if the person is not the owner.	YES, individuals Should first seek permission before any access to rural lands from the landowners.	NO, would these recreationalists or public individuals appreciate if the public trespassed in their yards without First seeking permission.

No	Fenced land should be treated different	Any means possible	Yes, it is difficult to contact every landowner. Landlines and listed numbers are less common. Landowners are often corporations or numbered companies. Farms are often miles from a piece of land.
no	do NOT treat all the same. Obvious habitation or current crops will be avoided by hunters and such. Plain pasture or stubble does not need to be protected	Any legislation will require a visit and written permission to work. Phone calls and verbal permission are subject to conflict by both sides. Being forced to get written permission will be a huge burden on the land owner in popular areas where hundreds will seek permission. Also a near impossible situation for hunters. Absentee landowners who are in Arizona create voids. The sheer numbers of permissions required to conduct many hunts will be impossible to accomplish due to time and cost.	Very much an impediment to hunters. Over 90 % of land is not posted and the farmers don't really care about the hunting. Those that do, Post the land and hunters just drive further on. A small vociferous group is leading this push for permission with a whole other agenda in play that the govt doesn't realize.
Getting permission is always a good idea, but not always possible. Most RM maps are out of date or land is owned by out of province companies	standing crop or swathed crop could be classed differently from fenced area	verbal permission	
No. I fail to see the issue with going out and posting your land if you do not wish to have individuals on your farm land. I have spoken with several land owners with the opinion that "as long as I don't have crop on the land, it's not an issue". Furthermore I have been given the impression multiple times both directly and indirectly that getting 100 phone calls for access for hunting or recreating would be a major and unwanted inconvenience, particularly when most of the calls would come at harvest. I have also been told they would find it less of a pain to post it all and not have to field the time phonecalls, or sign permission slips.	This is at the discretion of the landowner. Not me.	Again you can refer to my first answer. Multiple responses to my conversations with landowners, of which a handful own 30,000 acres or more have clearly stated that mandatory permission, written or verbal is an unwanted inconvenience and would likely lead to closure of their land to public access.	Yes. As per my first and third answer I have been advised that it would lead to closure to public access. It is an inconvenience to landowners to have to sign or give verbal permission. They do not post their land to avoid that issue.
No.	Yes	Reverse onus. If they did not want anyone on land that does not have a residence they need to have no trespassing signs up	Yes. With privacy issues finding out who owns the land and what their contact number is becomes difficult
Fully agree that you need permission first	Same for all	Written, text or email first. RM should have contact information on file and provide to public if requested	No
Government of Saskatchewan, Absolutely not! For one of many reasons, land owners already have the right to post their land if they do not want people on their property. You're not giving land owners anymore rights than they already possess, it would just make the whole situation much more convoluted and puts strain on resources such as conservation officers as they would need to increase supervision and would create more disputes and conflict.	Once again, this is up to the land owner and how they want to manage their property. It is not up to a group of people to decide how you as a property owner decide what to do. Just as we as a community would not hand out a trespassing tickets when individuals walk their dogs past houses and their dog crosses onto your property. Why? because we as a society have deemed it acceptable to leave that decision up to each individual property owner.	If there are no hunting signs then you leave their land alone. If it says hungunf by permission Ask for permission by phone or in person.	It would prevent people from hunting, walking, photography, shed hunting and would make enjoying the outdoors seem like a huge hassle. If I want to walk my dog I have to get an RM map and find a phone number and wait for an answer if I can walk him or not unless I face a huge financial and criminal fine.
No	Yes, if there is active crop in the field and or swathed the proper thing to do would get permission to retrieve your game. If the gates are locked no vehicles are presumably allowed and foot traffic only.	Phone call or knock on door. Land owners contact info posted on 4 corners of land	Absolutely with out a doubt yes

Yes if the farm land is to be cultivated or it has farm animals on the land than it should be an offence to trespass. but if the land is already cultivated and has no animals and it has no trespassing signs than you don't need permission, if this goes through that you need permission to enter land after being cultivated without posting signs people will just enter the land forcibly at any time in trucks to get in quickly and out quickly making more of a mess by means of hunting or in off terrain vehicles. And you could see more poaching because anyone who doesn't ask permission and shoots an animal on someone's land and loads up the kill and drives away without putting tags on right away just so they can get something and not get caught that would be poaching even if they put the tags on later or not at all and keep hunting for more animals.	If property is fenced cultivated and has a lawn pasture than it should be an offence until permission is granted	Permission should be granted by phone calls /meeting land owner and if requested by permission of letter if need be	It would not be unrealistic but it would be annoying if your chasing an animal in hunting season and it goes onto another property that you don't have permission for and you have to get that permission and by the time whatever you were chasing is long gone
Yes	All land should be treated the same	Through the municipal office which should maintain a contact list.	No
Yes			
Yes, anyone looking to access land needs permission. Anyone not getting permission from the proper authority should be subject to a fine	All land used for agriculture purposes should be treated the same	Anyone seeking access can use a RM map to get the land owners name and can contact the land owner through the RM office. Verbal access should be binding and there would be no need to enter any property without permission.	No, this will open up a loop hole for crime and other illegal activities. Consent must be obtained for any and all activities on private land. Consent could be given for long periods of time or multiple accesses to the land, Not necessarily for every instance as long as both parties agree.
No		Phone or visit	
No. It's many circumstances it's nearly impossible to find out who owns land to even gain access. If a land owner doesn't want anyone on the land simply post it. I foresee a situation where landowners are flooded with calls for permission every fall, those that can be contacted anyway.	A distinction needs to be made.	If landowners want everyone accessing their land to ask permission then they need to be reachable. Posting contact info on land would help.	I'm a hunter and this would be a serious problem. As stated it's nearly impossible now to locate owners of much of the private property in the province. Some owners don't even live in the province. I think foot access to any land not posted should be allowed. All vehicle access (except to retrieve game) requires permission. This province is rampant with "road hunters" that drive all over fields and private property until they kill something. Someone hunting on foot leaves no trace behind.
Yes, and the permission should be written, so that if challenging someone on a neighbour's property, they can't say that they have permission when they don't.	All should be treated the same. Trespassing is trespassing. Why should anyone be able to go onto someone's property, no matter what type of property, without the owner's written permission or owner standing by, as when work is being done on the property by Sask Power, SaskTel, etc.	Reasonable effort should be made to locate the land owner to get written permission.	No one should be able to do recreational activities on someone else's land without the land owner's permission.
No	All the same	Asking by phone or in person	Yes
Yes	All land Treated the same.	In writing.	No
No, absolutely not. Posting is easy, but for much of rural Saskatchewan finding the landowner's contact information is virtually impossible. This is an extreme solution to a minor problem with better alternative solutions	Fenced land, gardens, and land that is "in crop" (i.e. has a crop on it at the moment) should be treated differently than other types of rural land and could require express prior permission	This question highlights exactly why the "reverse onus" of requiring prior permission on un-posted land is such a bad idea. I own a section of cultivated farmland that is miles from the nearest occupied farmstead, and none of the nearby people are actually the owners. How would anyone ever get my permission?	Absolutely. And it is totally unnecessary. It will destroy the sense of community in rural Saskatchewan that the current scheme fosters. It will further reduce the number of hunters and will therefore negatively affect hunter-funded conservation and wildlife management...BAD IDEA all around!!!!
No, it should not require permission	Yes, just post it or fenced	No seeking permission. Unless a plot map of the rm is available many farm owners do not own adjacent land. And sometimes impossible to tell where boundaries lay under snow	It is unreasonable. I live in a very small hamlet and walk my dogs, ride my horse, snowmobile and quad in the fields in either winter or after the cross have been removed. If I had to ask everyone whose property I accessed permission, I likely would cease to do these activities that I love.

<p>No " these contemplated changes seem to be a response to situations where a few bad actors are not following the rules. I firmly believe that access should be provided to all lands unless they are posted to the contrary. As the vast majority of us are ethical hunters, we will honour the postings " however the few bad actors will continue to do what they do regardless of whether the land is posted or if permission is granted or not. Once again, these types of changes will have a significant adverse impact on law abiding citizens/hunters and have little or no effect on those few who choose not to follow the rules and cause the problems the contemplated changes are aimed at. As a hunter, it is extremely difficult to find out who actually owns specific quarter sections and/or who the occupier is. This isn't like 40 years ago when you could see the homestead and go ask for permission face to face. Now the landowner now may well live 20 or 30 km away.</p>	<p>No distinction should be made for different types of land " if the owner doesn't want hunters etc to have access then the land should be properly posted.</p>	<p>Once again, if the land owner does not want to grant access to his/her property, the land should be properly posted. If you are going to move to some form of mandatory advanced permission (which I strongly disagree with) then I believe that hunters should be able to access a government website where permission to hunt can be requested and land owners can grant or deny permission. This electronic system could be used in conjunction with face to face written permission.</p>	<p>Prior consent of the landowner would, in my opinion virtually destroy the hunting industry in Saskatchewan. Farms are getting so large now, that finding the actual land owner/occupier is getting close to impossible. RM maps are so inaccurate that they are of little use. Talking to the nearest farmer, in many instances, is futile as they don't know the name or contact information for adjacent large magnitude land owners. Solution: Require the posting of lands when access is unwanted and let ethical hunters hunt respectfully on "unposted" land as they have for decades. Deal with the bad actors involved in criminal or other unacceptable activity appropriately " and let the rest of us " the vast majority " continue to pursue the outdoor activities that we love in the way we have for decades. Please don't penalize us for the behaviour of the few bad actors.</p>
<p>No. It can be very difficult to find landowners. Our system works well now the fines for trespass on posted land needs to be increased. A lot of non posted land is held by large corporations that do not post land. If permission is required these large properties will become no go zones because the landowners will be impossible to locate.</p>	<p>If landowners want no one on their land simply post it. Very easy. Make fines larger to discourage trespass.</p>	<p>Contact phone numbers be required on all RM maps. Failure to comply with current phone number should result in a fine</p>	<p>Yes like in Alberta it really restricts hunting. Especially pheasant where you are driving looking for specific ground cover. Would be impossible with this law especially if landowner doesn't want their land posted.</p>
	<p>There should be a definite distinction between cultivated land fenced property and pasture land.</p>	<p>In order for a legal activity to be undertaken in the example of hunting the Rural municipality should be bound to post on a central website up to date RM land owner maps and contact information so users seeking permission can contact the landowner for permission</p>	<p>Yes it would be a definite impediment in the hunting community and I can see many not going through the hassle to go out anymore. There is a big problem in Sask right now with outfitters hoarding land and paying off farmers for exclusive access and this will definitely be a paved road towards paid hunting which is exactly what landowners want. But when there's wildlife damage they come to the government for compensation.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All land for agricultural purposes be treated the same</p>	<p>That by the most direct route from a main access point</p>	<p>No it would not because in order to conduct ones business on another's land or property you need permission first</p>
<p>No. There is too many land owners that have Unlisted numbers or live in different provinces. If farmers don't want people in their land then post it. They can post it when they go out in the spring and work the fields. Some Farmers do it now.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	<p>If posted they should post their name and phone number or email</p>	<p>I think you will lose lots of hunters you hunt maybe one or 2 days a year. There is lots that only get a weekend to hunt whitetail or birds and don't have time to go scouting or try and find the landowners to get permission.</p>
<p>No I do not believe so, I believe hunters should have the right to retrieve legally killed game off land after it has been killed.</p>	<p>Same Any land that has been seeded to crop and hasn't been harvested should not be driven on</p>	<p>Contacting the land owner.</p>	<p>Yes absolutely</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same. How can snow mobile riders tell what they're driving on. Also people trying to get away with trespassing will say they didn't know what they were driving on. Why should I have to pay to fence my land</p>	<p>Each person should have to approach the land owner and receive verbal permission</p>	<p>That's not my problem. If they have time to drive around on quads and ski doos they have time to talk to landowners. There are tons of trails available- they should stick to them so I don't have to listen to noisy sleds.</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>Yes there should be a distinction</p>	<p>Owners of land should have a contact number attached to the posting of a property. Some RM maps are not up to date. Some owners of land live in other provinces</p>	<p>Yes as some land owners are not from Sask and it is impossible to get a contact</p>
<p>No. Innocent people will be impacted.</p>	<p>Distinction should be made.</p>	<p>Access to information must be provided to seek access at the municipal office.</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Yes No, for hunting yes but I have no problem with snowmobiles on my land if there is no crop in the field.</p>	<p>Should be all the same Yes, there should be distinction</p>	<p>In person or by phone Written permission or email would be best</p>	<p>Too bad Yes, very unreasonable for snowmobiling. You would not know whose land you are on 90% of the time. If the land is posted keep off. If not, use respect</p>

Yes	All land should be treated the same	Permission should be in writing and should be carried on the person or persons entering private lands	Consent is a must for all vehicles entering private or provincial leases for fire reasons.
yes	all land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same	Talk to the property owner in person and explain what you want to do	No
No	Yes	email or text	Yes!
Definitely. Rural property should be treated no differently than city property	Definitely, all land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	Permission should be sought by contacting the land owner. It should be the responsibility of the person seeking permission to find out whose land it is and they should approach the land owner for this permission. Permission should be granted in writing.	Making consent an express requirement in all circumstances may represent an impediment to recreational activities but it is NOT unreasonable. At present the liability falls on the land owner and this is definitely not right. The land owner has every right to give or deny permission to the public and to know where and when the public is on their land.
Yes	There should be no distinction between cultivated land, fenced property and open pasture land all land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. Doing so otherwise simply leads to confusion.	How an individual seeks initial and subsequent access permission to use an owners land for personal use i.e. pleasure is relatively simple. Once ownership is determined there are multiple ways to make contact with the owner for the purpose of access without needing to locate a residence.	Certainly not, recreational activities can be broadly defined to include large side by side atv's that are capable of creating significant environmental damage to native lands as well as cultivated fields. It is a matter of respect. Doing a bit of ownership research prior to crossing/playing on private land enhances the pleasure of a recreational activity. A false sense of ownership will ultimately lead to conflict.
I believe that consent should be required for enclosed land such as pastures, buildings, etc where a person would have to open a door or gate to gain access. I do not, however, believe that acts such as snowmobiling etc should require individual permissions during times when land isn't seeded (winter etc) as this would kill some of these sports entirely. I live in a rural area in southern SK where nearly 100% of all land is privately owned and we have an inadequate trail system for snowmobiles, atvs, cross country skier etc who all respectfully rely on the use of private lands. Currently, those who do not want these activities occurring on their lands post a simple "no trespassing" sign which keeps out honest law abiding citizens. Those who do not respect those signs currently, also would not respect a law change which required land permissions. The current system has worked for many years and I do not feel confident that a law change would lower crime rate or result in less trespassing situations.	As noted in my previous comment, I believe that fenced, posted or enclosed land constitute a reasonable expectation of privacy and I would understand if laws were changed regarding them. I do not, however, believe that the cultivated farm land which makes up such a large percentage of this province should be completely "off limits" so to speak.	This is part of the problem with the changes being sought. with the size of modern farms, it would be almost impossible for a snowmobiler etc to distinguish individual land owners, especially if they're exploring an area they're not familiar with. RM offices often have very limited hours and with land changing owners often etc I believe this system would be cumbersome for both sportsmen and rural municipalities and may not be taken seriously as a result.	As stated in previous comments, yes I do believe so. Many snowmobilers travel hundreds of kilometers per day and many areas of our province have inadequate trail systems which are mostly privately maintained by local snowmobile clubs. The expectation of these riders to request land access 1/4 section at a time would place unreasonable hardship on a mostly respectful group. If riders were expected to ride "trails only", I believe this would ruin the sport for many legitimate and respectful riders because of a few bad eggs. I believe that education and enforcement is a more reasonable course of action.
No, the current option to post land allows the landowner to choose.	All should be treated the same, increase fines for those that are not respectful of the current legislation or work with landowners for easements and tax options.	With more and more incorporated land, if posted it would be nice to have a contact number for permission or trespassing.	Yes, I love to hike the valleys throughout the province and always leave the area cleaner or better than started.
No	No	Knocking on the door	Yes
Yes, absolutely. Private property is private property, regardless of its form (e.g. yard, pasture, field, etc.).	No, all land should fall under the same regulations.	Written and/or verbal permission as per the land owner's discretion.	No. As stated before, private property is private property. No one should be allowed to step foot on another's property without permission from the land owner, period.
No. Use taxpayer money, or funds from hunting licences, to provide the required signage (free of charge to the landowner). Alternatively, if the decision is made to require permission: use taxpayer, or some of the proceeds from hunting licences to provide a landowner with signs indicating that "x" activities are allowed. Such signage would only mean what the sign says. I.e. "hunting permitted" does not mean "ATVs permitted".	Yes. Nobody should hunt where cattle are present. Nobody wants an accident. Provide proper signage to the landowners, free of charge, at the expense of hunters (through hunting licences), snowmobile or atv (through licences). I am not up to date on ATV/snowmobile licences. But perhaps a license should be required if operating an ATV anywhere is required. (Unless on a landowners' own property)	If the landowners simply want permission, provide them with signage, free of charge, through hunting/ATV/snowmobile licence proceeds. The signs may indicate "for permission to access: call or email or text ____"	It would definitely impede opportunities that may present themselves. Time is of the essence in many hunting situations. Many people will be discouraged from hunting if there is too much red tape. You never know when an opportunity to kill a crop-eating animal might arise, and a hunter cannot shoot it because of the red tape involved. Reasonable access needs to be maintained. Especially in areas where homes and livestock are far from danger.

<p>No. As a hunter I respect all peoples property anything posted is off limits. Anything not posted has been considered accessible. Trying to find out who owns what piece of property is usually a painful exercise. Hunting involves driving many, many miles each day potentially in every single direction in a zone just for the chance to see some game. If limited to only one little location it would severely reduce hunting and thus controlling the population levels of animals.</p>	<p>Land is land. During hunting land is typically buried in snow just fyi. But a road on the land can usually be seen. This is what may be used unless of course a hunter has shot an animal and needs to get to it. The land is not hurt by a single vehicle driving on it.</p>	<p>As a Hunter if I see a homestead I would always travel by the main road to the house to speak to the owner. I have never heard of anyone driving across a open field to a house in a distance. Except for bad hunters I also have never seen anyone drive across a field that did not have a road along or across it.</p>	<p>As a hunter it would represent an unreasonable impediment to hunting activities. I am from a small town and have relatives that are farmer/ranchers. With considerable areas of land. Game does not limit itself to their land. As I have a very limited time table to hunt in, taking time off of work, I may never even see a single animal if limited only to their land. I may drive hundreds of miles searching and searching and searching around a few small towns in a little corner of the province and be lucky to find a single animal.</p>
<p>all land should be crown land and farmers and ranchers should just lease it ,but with restrictions on what could be cultivated,there is far too much marginal land fallen prey to the plough.</p>	<p>same</p>	<p>should ask for permission, but with farms so big and spread out it is hard to find the owner or renter many times.</p>	<p>recreational activities should have certain guidelines.</p>
<p>Yes, signing land only keeps honest people out. In some cases the signs get removed by people that are not suppose to be there.</p>	<p>No, when it comes to hunting it should be up to the land owner not to allow people on their land if there are livestock present or standing crop or winter seeded crops.</p>	<p>written permission would be best. That would remove any doubt if access was granted.</p>	<p>Hunting is the biggest concern for me. Crop damage and gates getting left open are becoming a huge problem.</p>
<p>No I don't think we need that. I own land and don't post it. I don't want endless calls from people all day long for the hunting season. Leave it as it.</p>	<p>Law should be left the way it is now. If the law did come in, maybe just pasture land needing permission.</p>	<p>Verbal good enough. Written permission is to much.</p>	<p>Might as well punish everyone, shut everything down. Kids will just play on iPads instead of enjoying the outdoors. My kids like going outside</p>
<p>Yes. And I also think it should be written permission good for a year.</p>	<p>No all private property should be treated the same. It makes no difference if someone is in your front yard or your backyard...It is still trespassing.</p>	<p>Written. First contact could be by phone...just add landowners phone number on the R.M. maps.</p>	<p>No. I would like to know who and why someone is on my farm. I think the uproar is because of A.T.V. going through crops pasture fences and making ruts in mud.</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. Otherwise, it becomes a matter of interpretation, and the lawyers will make some money!</p>	<p>Permission should be sought in person. Permission should be granted in the form of a written, signed, and dated document that both the landowner and the individual seeking permission have a copy of. The document should be a form document so that there is no doubt about what permission is given, by whom, when, and for how long. I think that is important to note that the landowner would be granting access for what period of time.</p>	<p>No, making consent an express prerequisite prior to access does not represent an unreasonable impediment. We are talking about people who go on other people's land and rip up crops, scare cattle and horses, damage farm machinery, and invade a rural landowner's privacy. I do not go walking in hunting season as I am afraid for my safety and this is on my own land. Why should I be hostage? People who want to snowmobile and quad can use marked and groomed trails that are all around the province.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>No</p>	<p></p>	<p>No</p>
<p>No. Certain activities should keep current legislation. In particular I believe that snowmobiling access legislation should stay as it is right now. If it were required to get consent for all land there would be no more snowmobiling in certain parts of the province where no trail network exists. Given the large distances that modern snowmobiles can travel in a day, and the patchwork of land ownership that exists, it would be impossible to acquire explicit consent to access all land.</p>	<p>I think all land for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>Detailed maps will need to be made available and distributed either in physical form or on the internet so that it is evident who owns what and where they live. Then owners should be able to decide what methods they want. ie phone, email, or in person. If in person, then yes, they should access from the most direct road.</p>	<p>If these proposed changes were made, I would no longer be able to snowmobile where I currently do. Since the people I ride with and myself tend to do cross-country riding with a riding radius of approximately 100 km in all directions from our cabin at Wakaw Lake, it would be nearly impossible to contact all owners. There are no snowmobile trails near us and ditches are poor and often unsafe. If these laws changed I would likely sell my snowmobile and stop supporting many of the small towns around us, where in the winter we often snowmobile to the restaurants for lunch or dinner and to refuel our sleds. I think changing to a "blanket permission required for access" regardless of activity would hurt the snowmobile industry in Saskatchewan greatly.</p>

Yes.	All land should be treated the same.	Yes to approaching on site habitations from main access point (eg from public road onto private driveway). If absentee or not on site landowner wishes they could enter contact information into a database or list created at the municipal office for that purpose. This should not be a requirement though as it is their land and they just may not want people on it.	No it would not. The word in the statement above, "recreational", indicates a want and not a need. A land owner should not be inconvenienced or annoyed by someone else indulging in a one sided activity like this.
Yes Yes, absolutely!	Treated the same All treated the same.	Phone RM maps are available to purchase for anyone. For \$10 they can purchase one. Then they can find the homestead, which are clearly marked on these RM maps, and approach the landowners for permission. It may not be the most convenient but it can be done. We have had people come to our yard with an RM map asking permission. As rural land owners, we find that anyone who has gone the extra mile to access a RM map and find the land owners to gain permission are not going to cause any issues. They are following the rules that are in place. The ones we have problems with you never hear from in advance, you just catch them on your property in passing or find the ATV or vehicle track after the fact, or find our gates open. You need to make the laws stiffer to help favor the land owners.	No No it is the only way.
Absolutely Yes	All land should be treated the same	Written permission , including land location . Public should be able to get contact info from Rm office	No it will not
No			
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	Every RM has a map, it is up to the person wishing to go on a specific area to find out who owns it and contact the land owner by phone, or in person. Many people are doing this now already. Good for both sides.	I don't think it would at all.
No	Distractions should be made	Government web site. Trying to get information from RMs is impossible.	Very unreasonable. Animals when wounded can easily run across multiple sections and it makes it impossible to get permission.
Yes	No distinction, trespassing is trespassing!!	Written pemision only,we have had to many cases where a nieboughr catches a treaspaser on our property. When confronted they lie and say i gave them permission. e and say o gave them permission	No
Yes!!!!	All land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same.	Via municipal offices	My family snowmobiles and hunts and wouldn't consider entering someone else's property without consent. Snowmobile trails are available where clubs get permission from landowners.
YES	Yes	In writing	No

Yes - this has been long overdue!!! Rural landowners have been figuratively beaten long enough. Its time for the farmers to have their rights back.	All land treated the same! Under snowfall how is one to determine?	Through RM offices. There needs to be minimum fines and increased penalties and enforcement. The justice system needs to come into alignment where the judges support RCMP through law and legislation. Too many times resources are wasted on catching illegal activities when they are simply thrown out of court!	No one should have rights to enter my property without permission whether in town or on a farm!
Yes not only for hunting and pursuing wildlife but also now there is strains of canola diseases and pathogen's that can be carried from field to field now that addresses different issues and possible lawsuits landowners have to do what they can to minimize traffic on owned property Yes it all has to be down to the landowner to give written authorization whether a hunter or the public can go on that land And the penalties have to be way steeper and elevated due to the upcoming concerns of soil borne diseases	Yes with the upcoming soil born diseases all traffic can be minimized yes all land should have the same law it would also cut down on the crime in the rule area	With the little permit books that natural resources supply	Asking permission should not be regulated by the seasons if they want to go on the land they still have to ask no matter what season of the year or what time of the year
No, unless the land is properly posted. People need more respect not more laws. This stinks of a garrison attitude and would likely lead to more vigilantism.	Treat it all the same, much simpler, always better.	This shouldn't be needed in 99% of the cases, but I favour a phone number posted on No Trespassing signs.	Yes. Licensing of atvs is what's needed.
Yes	All should be treated the same.	Talk with producer - written consent.	No. Not if stay on designated snowmobile trails etc where snowmobile clubs etc have already sought out permission
Yes and it should apply to land, ground, lawn and other places used for agriculture production of crops or livestock.	Yes, a distinction	In writing (email, letter) or verbal	It may be unreasonable however people are not supposed to driving their recreational vehicles on private land.
Yes	No distinction, ALL privately owned property should be treated the same	As compromise all property owners should allow anyone visiting or seeking permission for access to hunt etc to enter private property at primary entrances to property with clearly maintained roads or driveways beyond the point of entry as long as there is not a closed gate across such entrance or signage indicating no trespassing without permission, Also if a property owner posts a phone number or email, make contact through that means Government should have a web site where property owners can register should they want certain species hunted on their property Property owners could post land open for hunting a certain species with clear rules like stay on trails	Not at all and I don't own land, there is a lot of crown land, parks, lakes etc in sask that everyone has access to or feel free to buy your own land, since any rules now or new apply to all property owners seems to be fair.
Yes everyone needs to get prior approval before going onto someone else' Land so that we can stop all the damage being done now without this law we should also be able to protect our own property from trespassers	All land should be treated the same.	They need to ask the landowners in person and than they can be given written permission so you know who is on your land and when they will be on it	No I don't believe so as this will stop all unwanted damage to property and can hold damage doers accountable
Yes you are charged with trespassing Commercial or urban areas why should rural areas be neglected and perceived any different	No property is property treat it all the same		No
Yes they should just like access to feedlots pig barns chicken barns they are all required to have permission to enter and that would eliminate a lot of vandalism Pertaining to tramping of crops and theft in rule areas	No not at all now with club root in canola it can easily be spread by hunters vehicles all-terrain vehicles yes it can be spread by wildlife but we can minimize it drastically by restricting the movement on the land	By little permission booklets supplied by natural environment and resources or written permission by a landowner	No not at all
yes	All ag land should be treated the same	Access the the person giving permission by a road, or call, text, email. keep written permission with you when on the land. Email or text works for written permission	No. With electronic technology, obtaining written permission would not represent an unreasonable impediment

Yes	All should be treated the same	Previous written from owner or land user	No it wouldn't be. ATVs and snowmobiles have caused damage in the past and now it's time for that to end. There's lots of places for them to have their fun other than private land
No	All the same.	By email	It would make it very difficult to hunt in rural SK as in our area virtually all the land is owned by absentee landowners.
No	No	Via Email	Yes
Yes permission should be sought for private and public lands no matter what kind of activity is going to be portrayed on it and very stiff penalties need to be administered to these offences	No not at all	By written permission face to face with land owner	No even if it does there is too much abuse with vehicles and other altering vehicles regarding no respect for private and public owned lands
No	No	Email	Yes
No	No	Via email as many of the property owners are absentee land owners	No
Yes. Unless they have written permission along with a signature they should have no access at all.	All treated the same	To seek consent should be done by phone and or email but must be done prior to entering lands. A meeting would need to be set up to get the written permission with a signature.	Yes
Yes, a person without a signed permission should be charged with an offense if they are found on privately owned farm land without a written permission slip. Hopefully that would reduce the number of armed, drunken guys that I encounter on my land and the general property damage that ensues.	If it is privately owned it should be treated the same. The burden of trespasser should be born on public lands with the attendant costs of policing and damages also born by the public, (i.e. a government agency like Parks Saskatchewan).	I would suggest that Landowners should be able to opt in to an internet based permission granting system if the were so inclined.	It shouldn't. Without permission they shouldn't be there.
All activities are not the same. Someone on a snowmobile does not have the same impact for moving soil or weeds as a hunter. Also hunters in my pasture with my cattle concern me more than a snowmobile across cultivated acres. Quads are the in between. More likely to do soil damage.	Distinction between types or between posted or not.		
YES	All should be treated the same. Trespassing is trespassing.	All individuals should first get permission in person or by direct contact (telephone) from the land owner.	No, consent would not be unreasonable. I ride horse on the property of others and should be asking permission before doing so. I wouldn't have to ask every time I went on the property though.
I am less concerned about snowmobiles transmitting disease and weeds than hunters quadders or horses.	Fenced posted land should be off limits. I do not want hunters in with my cattle. Cuntivaed land should need permission for any spring summer fall activity.	At farm yard in person accessed via roads. Also be prepared to show id and leave contact info	No
Yes	All the same	In person	No
As a snowmobile rider and a small farmer I feel this will greatly impact our sport their are very few trails around Saskatoon and freely riding around is something I enjoy the most. Now I have no problem staying of land if their is any reason especially if I've been previously told or asked to leave it is their land and I don't need a reason, or if you can see a crop that hasn't been harvested or a sensitive field but if it's open land and not posted I would like to be able to continue to ride freely like I've been doing for over 30 years especially since snowmobiles are minimally evasive I understand quads would be much more evasive and should ask first especially before going mud riding. I live in the city and to keep my land private I had to invest in a 6 foot fence now I know size plays a huge role but a few small signs will go along way	I think there should be a difference. And added to the above should be all yards occupied or not	I think a email on any posted land would be better than looking for the homestead	I think it would be devastating to snowmobile riders especially since u can cross a quarter in minutes and it's Easy to travel 150 to 200 kilometres a day and your on frozen land covered in snow
Yes. Couple of questions... how often does one get permission. Weekly, monthly, yearly, verbal/written. Land owners change. Wouldn't want to see someone changed if the land just changed hands.	All the same.	Province could make a standard form for all to use and be signed showing the land owner gives permission plus is not liable for anything that happens to the one wanting access	Sask snow association currently has permission forms for land use as per the snowmobile act.

Yes	All land being used for agriculture purposes should be treated the same	Call the land owner prior to stopping by their residence, and or seek permission by going to the residence through the most direct access and asking permission	No it would not. If they want to use that land they should always be in contact and have permission from landowners
No. RM land ownership maps too often out of date so public can't find out who owns the land. Also, SaskParty conservatives sold off a lot of public land, and opened up land sales to non-residents, so lots of land owned by absentee landowners, (land "bankers" i.e., speculators) or big corporate ag companies, so difficult to contact for access permission.	Yes, there should be a distinction between cultivated land, fenced property and open pasture land. No, land being used for agriculture should not all be treated the same.	If permission must be sought, then landowners must provide and maintain clear, indelible contact information. At a minimum, phone numbers, email addresses, physical addresses and even a map to the residence of a LOCAL contact person should be permanently displayed on each corner of a quarter section, and also along the property line equidistant between the corners so that the public. Landowners must also be available to be contacted, and must respond to contact attempts within a reasonable amount of time. Landowners who fail to do this should be subject to legal and/or financial penalties.	Yes. Also, landowners should not be allowed to block, deny, conceal or intimidate against access along undeveloped rights-of-way. Access along undeveloped rights-of-way must continue to be allowed without permission.
Yes	All land being used for agriculture should be treated the same		
Not a great idea. Sledding across a field covered in snow is many times unavoidable. When riding 100 miles or more in a day, it is impossible to figure out before hand exactly which land you may or may not cross. This is the same as many useless gun laws, not punishing offenders while punishing law abiders, seems to be the trend now adays. I agree that theft and vandalism in rural areas is at an all-time high and something must be done. But simple trespassing on harvested land harms nothing.			
I believe one should get permission but I feel that there should be a certain set of signs and rules pertaining to them . Example if an owner will allow permission the posted signs should be with written permission only etc . And land owners should post there land as a mandatory thing. I as a land owner/ hunter allow access but I still always post to know who is coming in and out.	I think all land should be only accessed on foot .	Verbal as some major companies that own land are not local . But written where available.	I believe so for snowmobiles as snowmobiles do minimal damage
Yes!	Yes!	Approach the owner and ask for permission; written consent when the owner resides on a different property from the one in question.	No, it would not.
NO--there should be open access for foot travel on public (Crown) lands. In Finland, no permission access is allowed even on private lands so long as no harm or disruption to landowner. Seems we have a culture of doing harm that needs some education to get us back on the right track. While I can see both sides of the argument, public lands should at least have a different approach with designated routes (where vehicle travel is allowed) and no permission access for foot travel.	The main distinction (if any) should be between public (Crown) land and private land.	Contact information (email, phone or mailing address) for each land parcel should be available publicly. The landowner (for private land) could choose which contact method is preferable.	Motorized travel should only be by consent on private land or on designated routes on public (Crown) land. Motorized travel needs more restrictions than currently.
Definitely yes!	All land should be treated the same. (In the city, would a proposed bylaw suggest that if you grow a garden, no-one can trespass, but if you have a lawn instead, trespassing is okay?)	A lot of land is not locally owned. Farmers are not always home. - Keep the list at the RM office. - Landowners designate every parcel of land as: Access always, Access never, or Access with permission. If "access with permission", they must leave a contact number at the RM office. - It's not handy for hunters to wait for office hours. It's also not handy for me to have hunters firing shots 500 metres from my house without letting me know they're out there.	Snowmobilers can use ditches or trails. There are trails in provincial and some regional parks. But they need to ask permission to go on private land. What if we have winter wheat, or an unharvested crop under a thin layer of snow? We need a way to protect our property.

no we have a large province where there is large tracts of land and a sparsity of dwelling places. hunting will become even more difficult going thru more hoops when in all literature pertaining to, we see the cry out for more people involved in hunting	no it should not all be treated the same	this whole idea of clubroot is the direct result of these dam grainfarmers breaking their own rules by back to back cropping. its caught up to them. now they use the big excuse that a half ton truck will spread it, ie goose hunters, when we never hunt canola anyways for geese. i am a farmer and rancher. we have leafy spurge issues. the worst way of spreading any seeds is with wild animals. this becomes an excuse to never oblige any hunters of any sort. on any no hunting sign the landowners name should be clearly visible with a ph #	absolutely
Yes No, only when land is posted should permission be required.	Same No, there is a big difference between land use practices and access should reflect this.	Email is a good idea Permission could be granted through email and in person consultation. Have access to email addresses at RM offices would be helpful.	No Yes, it's not always possible to contact the landowner. The majority of folks are respectful of farmer's and rancher's property and should not be penalized for the bad behavior of a few individuals.
No requiring prior expressed permission by rural land owner or occupier regardless of the activity is too broad and general and rigid. It will not serve well.	Not all land should be treated the same. All land should be respected by the owner/occupier as well as any other person entering it. I note that First Nations Land is not cited in proposed Legislation. Please give info and background on why this is.	Person to person, either face to face, or by phone, email or text.	Requiring consent from the landowner for recreational purposes is important given that most recreational activities have an impact on the land and wildlife.
no	There should be distinctions		
NO	Yes, there should be a distinction.	Yes, to the first question.	Yes, it would.
no. banning activities such as wildlife viewing on foot denies the majority of the people of the province the chance to interact with the natural environment.	People that are using land for crop/garden have a right to expect that others will not damage the crop. However, the public has a right to access open pasture - especially considering that the government took away 2 million acres of crown land that belonged to us all.	people could ask landowners and/or find address/e-mail from town offices.	Even as the pop. of Sask. increases, fewer and fewer people seem to control virtual all the land. It seems unfair that over 90% of the people have no access to the land.
no	no	In urban centers anyone can approach a house and knock on a door. It seems like rural Saskatchewan is being turned in fortress farms where it will no longer be possible to safely approach a house and knock on a door.	This question seems irrelevant as the current legislation prohibits the use of these vehicles without permission.
absolutely not	yes a distinction	if landowners expect permission then their ph# should be on a sign on property	absolutely
No	Distinction for cultivated and fenced property	It should be assumed unless the land is posted no entry without prior consent AND the posting must provide a CURRENT method of contact (phone number). It should be the responsibility of the land owner to insure the posted phone number is up to date and if not, consent should be assumed. There should also be a right to seek out the homestead, because not all areas have reasonable cell phone coverage.	It would if the landowner was not required to provide their phone number posted on site because the increasing number of absentee landowners makes it more and more difficult to determine who owns a given parcel

<p>No. How is a person to find the owners now? I've hunted many years and unless an owner is living on the property in question it's almost impossible to locate them! Why does it seem it's always the law abiding citizens that get penalized over this when it's the people that are up to no good that are causing the problems! So if I have to cross a field on my sled they want me to stop and try finding the owners before I cross? I've seen a lot of posts where landowners are stating that they'd sabotage their property, barb wire equipment etc. So it seems that there's people on both sides that have serious issues with this! Why can there not be something in place that actually goes after the people that are up to no good getting charged and not always penalizing the people that are not causing damage or harm having more restrictions placed upon them?</p>	<p>I think that the land should be posted as is now and if people are caught damaging property or entering property when posted should be charged accordingly! Is there going to all of a sudden be an influx of people to enforce these laws? Will there be an app where everyone that wants access wether to cross a field or retrieve an animal in a timely manner can phone or at least have access to the most recent owner of the property and phone numbers if possible?</p>	<p>I'd think an app with land locations and phone #'s of actual owners or renters could grant or deny access! I'd also like to know how it works with claims for crop damage from wildlife when access to hunting is denied all the time! Because we all know it can be quite the pain to get ahold of owners now or they have no clue as to what the renters want!</p>	<p>Yea I believe it would! Like I've stated if you're crossing a couple fields to access different areas you're not going to take the time to drive all over the countryside and up to every farmer to hopefully find the rightful owner! If the land is posted properly and crops are still on the land it should definitely be respected as we've always done but to penalize everyone with the same brush is getting sickening as it's the ones that are up to no good that will not adhere to any laws that may be passed as we all know! But as the ones that are adhering to posted lands and respecting property owners requests will have to jump through more hoops as always!!</p>
<p>No. Why is Alberta used as a reference point. Why not study other enlightened western cultures to see how the individual and the public are treated under land rights legislation. E.g. in Sweden the basic right is one of free access. This survey is starting from the assumption that the privileged (i.e.those holding property and economic power) have the rights. are those for whom the laws are written.</p>	<p>No. The rule of no damage should apply - trespass without harm should be allowed as in many European countries.</p>	<p>None-occupied land (that without a residence) should not need advance permission. Owner contact information should be on signage and kept legible and current if permission is needed.</p>	<p>Preplanned, consumptive use of land should require advance permission (e.g. hunting, mechanized travel, exploitative gathering of commercial materials); non-consumptive or nondamaging activities such as walking, photography, simple appreciation and enjoyment or study of an area should not.</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>the same</p>	<p>Asking the owner in person and getting permission</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>No, I am strongly opposed to mandatory advance permission for lawful hunting and trapping activities, as well as non-consumptive uses (e.g. bird watching) when carried out on foot. With the shift to more corporate and investment ownership, obtaining permission to access private land has become an increasing challenge in recent years. Additional barriers to accessing land has the strong potential to result in fewer citizens connecting with nature and fewer hunters/trappers, which would ultimately reduce the ability of wildlife managers to properly manage game. Some examples include an inability to harvest enough animals to control populations, resulting in overabundant populations that would increase the risk of wildlife-vehicle collisions, crop depredation and disease transmission (e.g. chronic wasting disease), just to name a few. Not to diminish the real concerns of the 4% of Saskatchewan's population that are farmers/ranchers, but there are far more hunters, trappers and naturalists than there are farmers and ranchers and I feel this blanket approach to permission could have far-reaching negative effects on a large proportion of Saskatchewan's population, while only appeasing a very small vocal minority. Instead, perhaps some alternate solutions should be considered. There are already regulatory mechanisms in place for farmers/ranchers to ensure mandatory permission in accessing their land, should they want it, by posting signage. Farmers/ranchers often complain this is costly and time-consuming. To address this, Texas has a program in place where, instead of signage, landowners simply have to paint a specified section and number of fence posts purple. Through media campaigns, outdoor enthusiasts are made aware that a purple fence post means 'No Trespassing Without Permission' and it is far less costly and time-consuming on the landowner to maintain. Perhaps something similar could be considered in Saskatchewan. With all this said, I would support mandatory advance permission for activities where land access is in a vehicle, ATV or snowmobile, which I believe is causing many of the issues that led to mandatory advance permission being considered.</p>	<p>Separating these property types could become confusing and lead to unintentional offences. Perhaps the distinction should instead be between occupied and vacant land, regardless of use.</p>	<p>I would suggest advance permission for vehicle use (including ATV and snowmobiles) could be obtained either by written or verbal permission. By allowing landowners to choose the method, you reduce undue hardship on landowners in granting permission. Electronic communication methods (i.e. email, text) should be considered, as well. If any stricter permission laws are to be considered, it would be required that government put mechanisms in place for easy access to landowners. For example, having online tools (perhaps maps through HabiSask.ca) that provide rural municipality maps with all landowners contact information readily available to the public would be important. This may not be well-received by the agricultural community, but is necessary if any change is to be considered. Another consideration must be how the public accesses this information if they do not have access to online resources.</p>	<p>Yes, very much so and it disrespects the majority of Saskatchewan's population. The majority of the meat my family eats in a year is game that I have hunted on private or leased crown land. I take my child bird-watching and hiking in these locations to ensure he has a valuable connection to nature (and doesn't spend all his time behind a screen). Effective wildlife management ensures wildlife populations don't become overabundant, with the result being I have relatively safe roads to drive and the disease risk in the game I harvest is relatively low. Without a significant investment by government to greatly increase the amount of publicly-available land in southern Saskatchewan, all of this could be impacted by the proposed changes. Since many, if not the majority of, farmers/ranchers do permit access to their land when asked, why would the government make a change that negatively impacts such a large proportion of Saskatchewan's population just because less than 4% of the population can't be bothered to post a few signs? A far better solution would be to make posting land easier and/or tackling the root of the problem, which is often those accessing the land with vehicles/ATV's/snowmobiles.</p>
<p>yes. one would never think of walking thru their neighbors yard in town. Why should it be different for driving across land in the country. Would help control spread of soil and plant born disease by tires. With increased use of grain bags, farmers are out in the fields in the off season. if they are in another part of the field a hunter may not realize they are there. Thus increasing the risk that someone may get injured by a gunshot.</p>	<p>No. That can lead to confusion regarding what type of land it is.</p>	<p>By phoning or talking to the land owner. People don't always check their e-mail frequently. Likewise not everyone uses Facebook or twitter.</p>	<p>No. If landowner are liable for injuries acquired on their land, they should have a say on who is there.</p>
<p>Yes. This should be written permission by the land owner to the members of the public so the Conservation officers have the proof. This should be dated yearly as required.</p>	<p>Yes, all land used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>1st. seek permission at farm owners inhabited residence by the most direct route from a main access point.</p>	<p>I don't see why it should if they respect the land owners property. Farmers cannot go to town &amp; drive over home owners lawns or property. Why should farmers have to put up with this.</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>All land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same.</p>	<p>Forms at R.M. or Rural Environmental offices filled out by applicant ; then presented to land owner for permission.</p>	<p>No.</p>

<p>No - some access is completely benign. I would hate to see Saskatchewan developing a fortress mentality. We have a lot of land and few people. Surely we can share the land peacefully and respectfully.</p>	<p>I don't think the land use is as important as the activity of the person on the land. If they are being destructive they should be ticketed but if they are just taking a walk and enjoying the views no problem. If there is risk of club root spread then the land should be posted.</p>	<p>Asking by approaching the house directly is best. I am not comfortable with letting the RM office give out my contact information to anyone who claims they want to seek permission to access. If nobody is home when they come to the house then they don't have permission.</p>	
<p>Yes. Maintaining safety and security of one's private property should be placed at a higher priority than appeasing the minority of the population that engages in activities that are mostly recreational. One should not have to sacrifice their sense of security for such activities, nor should they have to incur the costs to mark their properties to that effect. Private property by its very definition is not open to the public.</p>	<p>All private rural land should be treated the same. The land type does not necessarily distinguish its sensitivities nor any hidden dangers. Furthermore, not all private land, even that used for purposes other than agriculture, should have to be fenced or cultivated to indicate private use. Private land is private land, period.</p>	<p>If a landowner wants his or her land deemed private, it may be reasonable for the owner to be required to provide a contact phone number to the RM office for publishing on RM ownership maps. If a hunter or snowmobiler would like access for any respective reason, they can purchase an RM map with the contact information. Being granted permission should be written or verbal from the landowner only. If the owner cannot be contacted, permission is not to be assumed. However, I would suggest that one exception be considered, that being if game has fled onto adjacent land after being shot. If the landowner cannot be reached, a conservation officer may provide temporary permission for the hunter to retrieve the game as required by provincial hunting regulations. However, liability, should the hunter be hurt in the process of accessing the land, should not lie with the conservation officer, only the requirement that the animal be retrieved.</p>	<p>No, this does not represent an unreasonable impediment. It may require that those looking to take part in the recreational activities plan ahead and secure the necessary permission for accessing the lands by contacting the owners, but this is reasonable considering that the lands is private in the first place and they should not be "entitled" to this access otherwise.</p>
<p>Yes, members of the public should require permission to access rural owned or occupied land before entering it and should be an offense if they do not get consent prior to accessing it.</p>	<p>All agricultural land should be treated the same and require consent to access.</p>	<p>Permission should be sought by travelling a maintained access road to a rural homestead and arrive at the homestead residence. Or Use of a Rural Municipal map to identify the land owner or occupier of said land and contact through a telephone number. Email for the age of rural population and poor internet service would be poor option for contact.</p>	<p>Making consent for access a requirement would make accessing land more available to many. As of now we have all our land marked No trespassing No hunting as it is the only little bit of control we have to not get shot at in our yard in hunting season. The people who personally know us know if they ask for consent they get it to a reasonable number of people at a time. The general population sees the signs if we can keep them up and do not ask.</p>
<p>If you are on ATV or other vehicle or a hunter it is reasonable to have to get expressed permission to access a rural land owners property. These are the main culprits and the reason for this consultation. Huge fines are necessary. As well snowmobiles need to be fined heavily on highway ditches and when owners of these cross private lands. All ATV/snowmobiles must be fined heavily if using crown lands. Once, My vehicle (newer vehicle) was making unusual noises and indications on panel indicated to stop vehicle. I did and walked about a mile during the winter across private land to get to the neighbours home to call dealer. Got instructions what to do and returned to car and luckily got on my way. In my case it was not reasonable for me to take the long way to the owners home. In the event I would ever be in the position to having to enter property I would be sincerely worried about being shot in view of some peoples attitudes/racism.</p>	<p>Private property should be properly fenced to ensure that it is understood that it is private property and no access unless owner given permission. Person accessing should get written permission, and thus can be verified very quickly.</p>	<p>Written permission by owner of the private property.</p>	<p>It is unreasonable for ATV, snowmobiles or any vehicle to assume they have a right to access to private property. Hikers should not cross private property unless property not properly indicated .</p>
<p>yes, except in emergency situations such as fire and ambulance/air ambulance</p>	<p>treated the same</p>		

For hunting and atv use in summer yes. For snowmobile use, no. If you don't want Snowmobiles on your property, you should have to post your land accordingly as per current legislation	If it is land you don't want people on, it should be posted.	For hunters, contact in person in advance or via email through the rm office. For sled season-no prior consent-post the land if you want people to stay out	Hunters have specific areas to be in, and prepare all year for their short windows of access, so getting permission should be reasonable. Also important because of firearm use near where people live and work. Snowmobile users go out every day for months at a time in a vast array of territory, so permissions would be highly unreasonable. Responsible sledders and atv riders aren't the ones causing damage and trouble, so why are we all being punished for the improper actions of a few?
ITS ONLY RIGHT IF A PERSON OWNS THIER OWN LAND THEY SHOULD HAVE ALL RIGHTS , TO SAY WHO CAN COME ON OR NOT ENTER PROPERTY, THAT SHOULD NOT BE UP TO THE GOVERNMENT , BECAUSE IF IT HAS THEN WHY BUYING OWN LAND ITS IF FOR PRIVACY USE?	NO AS THE OWNER SEES FIT ITS HIS/HER LAND ..NOT THE GOVERNMENTS,,	TO CONTACT OWNERS, OF THE SAID LAND IN THE LEGAL FORMS	NO, I THINK IF SASK POWER OR ENGERY IS COMING ON A PRIVATE LAND , THEY SHOULD NOTIFY THE OWNER,,,, IF HE IS NOT AVAILBLE THEN ASK SOME ONE THAT WOULD HAVE THE SAME EQUAL LEGAL RIGHTS OF OWNERSHIP (eg) IF A PARNETS OWN LAND AND CANNOT BE CONTACTED THEN NEXT TO KIN ,OR SIBLINGS OR WHO EVERY WOULD BE THE TRUSTEE OR, WHO MIGHT BE TAKING CARE OF SAID PROPERTY
Yes	All land should be treated the same	In what ever manner is convenient and available for the landowner or the legal occupant of the land. For example not everyone has email/ internet or checks it regularly.	I feel it would NOT represent an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities. It would actually make it safer for everyone if you knew who was on your land and for what purposes. Living of a farm with [REDACTED] has resulted in some interesting encounters with people from the city who feel it is their right to walk/run their dog on my land, dirt bike up my driveway and cross my pasture with their snow machines cause the snow was deep enough in places to cover the fence.
Saskatchewan MUST update legislation to require express permission for all land. Beyond safety concerns with regard to rural crimes, hunting alone is putting Saskatchewan landowners and agricultural workers in danger. After many incidents of extreme danger on our own "posted" land, we no longer feel safe to work our own land, tend our livestock, or have our employees put in such situations. This has become a steadily increasing concern, yet could be easily rectified with new legislation.	All land being used for agricultural property must be treated the same. A lack of fence may only mean a farmer is around the corner fencing. Cultivation can be difficult to determine under snow. All efforts must be made to keep legislation simple and predictable so that offences are enforceable.	Entrance through obvious lane ways to inhabited yard sites is a reasonable way to seek permission. Also, lists of email addresses and/or phone numbers through rural municipalities would be helpful to both landowners and those seeking permission.	Issues with current legislations does not only create concerns personal property safety and animal welfare, human safety has become an enourmous concern. While it is unfathomable to fear being shot while doing your job here in Canada, it has become an all too real concern for farmers and ranchers here in Saskatchewan. Human safety MUST outweigh recreational activities. That being said, hunting, snowmobiling and ATV use are valid activities, and must not be hindered. Seeking permission is a small ask, one that is expected in many other parts of North America.
No. In my area, much of the land is owned by corporations and numbered companies which makes it very difficult to get permission. The RM is not allowed to give out contact information and many of the people don't actually live on the farms. Further more, when hunting animals frequently cross over property lines and therefore ethically you would need permission from everyone within 2 miles just in case.	I think there should be a distinction, much of the cultivated land is not in danger once the crop has been removed.	I think if permission will be mandatory, then contact information should be required to be posted. I agree an in-person meeting is a better method but not always possible.	Sometimes it would. Again if I shoot an animal on land A which I have permission for but runs onto land B which I don't then I cannot legally recover my animal
No, The SK legislation should NOT provide that all access by members of the public to rural property requires the prior express permission of the rural landowner or occupier	The question of further distinction between different types of land is based on the purpose for the need for distinction and therefore as I am opposed to the change in trespass laws in SK this is an irrelevant or spurious question without further clarification as to why such distinctions would be required	verbally	The short answer is yes; making consent an express requirement in all circumstances would be an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities
No	No	if posted check for permission otherwise obtain access on foot	Yes it would

Yes.	All lands privately owned should require permission in order to be on the land regardless of current use of land or non use of land.	It would be acceptable to use the obvious path, driveway, lane to the owner's point of residence or what might be expected to be the residence to ask permission to be on the land.	No. Would people entering your home for recreational activity ie watch TV, play cards etc. without your permission sound reasonable?
Privately owned land is under the control of the owner or lease; access on to controlled lands should only be under permission or granted access. This should apply to all people	The need to define lands covered by trespass act would need to be clear. Lands can appear "unoccupied or non-agricultural" but still have an expectation by the owner to be private. Private lands may be cycled for management reasons, but still be in use which can cause confusion over access. ie. hunting access regulated and treaty.	Access by the most direct route is reasonable; however there should be a provision defining direct route. Many rural owners work various points of their land and homesteads; there is NO reason for a person seeking permission to be around outbuildings, or equipment. For this reason an option for land owners to post an alternate communication where access maybe offered is reasonable	The requirement for permission may complicate a persons recreational access to lands, but it does not create an infringement to their movements; but allowing free access to owned land does infringe a landowners stewardship to their lands.
No, do not support this. The current law and posting application is adequate and works for the majority of landowners. As a hunter, I always try to obtain permission. The problem is that there is an increasingly number of absentee landowners, who you have no way to contact, even with RM maps. In my opinion, more strict access laws would have unintended consequences, impacting only law-abiding recreational resource users and do very little to stop those accessing land for criminal intent.	No, for most hunters and recreational users there is little distinction between land types as access is pursued on all categories. The current procedure of posting lands where access is prohibited works well in most cases. The key to this is properly enforcing the current laws, rather than trying to create new ones specific to land cover.	The current procedure for contacting a landowner is still preferable. Landowners often want to meet those accessing their lands to judge their intentions. Access by the most direct route (ie. via farm access road) is already the norm for most and those that abuse it can be dealt with in other ways. RM listing of landowners by email or phone numbers would be helpful, but even there, contacting absentee landowners or seeking permission to lands owned by a corporate entity remain a significant issue.	Yes, in my opinion. It sounds simple in practice, but in reality, is not a very workable situation. Trying to contact an increasingly number of absentee landowners or corporate owners is a significant impediment to recreational activities, and as for criminals, seeking permission probably doesn't matter. The current rules work well in the vast majority of cases and a prior consent requirement would, in my opinion, significantly reduce recreational users (or maybe just make criminals of us). Strongly suspect that rural demand for "prior consent" is localized (ie. around cities) and could be better addressed through enforcement, than additional legislation.
no	the need to differentiate land types is based on a need for enhanced trespass laws and hence the need for the prior needs to be resolved before the answer to this subsequent question can be addressed	the need to differentiate the type and manner of permission being granted is based on a need for enhanced trespass laws and hence the need for the prior needs to be resolved before the answer to this subsequent question can be answered	Yes it would be an unreasonable impediment to individuals and it would also create very significant second (the number of people that would stay active as hunters or enter into the sport in future) and third order effects (the amount of money that hunters would: 1) spend in license fees used for wildlife habitat development and protection; 2) the amount of money that hunters would spend in the SK economy for goods and services to practice their hunting sports; and 3) the level of political support from hunters for environmental issues in SK would decrease)
Yes	All land should be treated the same. If someone owns it, permission should be obtained	Phone call. Not everyone has email or checks it regularly. If you want permission talk to the RM for a map and call the owner	No it would not be unreasonable. I am a hunter and get permission before going on someone else's land. I am also a farmer and have had to deal with people coming onto my land without permission. They have let my cows out by leaving gates open.
Yes!	All treated the same!	Before entering the land. Locate the owner and ask permission prior.. get an RM map and or locate the owner through the RM	No. Ask permission first
Yes, except on improved or unimproved road allowances, roads that are not marked (lawfully and rightfully) as private, and except on Crown land.	Logical distinction based on land use as appropriate. Open pasture that is not posted or otherwise not apparently occupied should not be treated the same. Especially if said pasture is held in the Crown.	It is reasonable to seek permission directly at an onsite inhabited residence where one exists. Where there is no onsite inhabited residence the occupant and/or landowner should provide a reasonable amount of information for contact info in the event that such access permission is to be sought.	No

<p>No in most some cases. For hunting practices if the land in not fenced or signed than I could be implied consent. If fenced then permission required</p>	<p>Yes there should be a difference. One must realize that on all crown leased land in Alberta hunters do have access to the land. There is a lot of leased crown land in SK so if we want to be like Alberta then we need to ensure that SK landowners cannot turn away hunters</p>	<p>This is a tough one. I believe most of this trespass legislation review came from the break and enters in the Battleford area. If we say access is required to attend the residence it just gave someone access to your yard. The person(s) could then knock on your door... if no one is present they could possibly B &amp; E the place. On the flip side many landowners like to meet hunters before granting permission. I believe a phone call or meeting in person is the best when establishing a relationship with a landowner.</p>	<p>This is tough but yes. In my 20 years plus in working in law enforcement and 35 years on hunting I have found that about 75% of the landowners have no problems with hunters and snow machines. As said 75% do not mind but 25% do. Around the cities I think you would find that maybe more landowner do not like the laws as they are, but out in the rural country you would be hard pressed to find a landowner upset that a snowmachine is on their land. If permission was required, landowners could get a lot of phone calls, emails, knocks on the doors, resulting in upset landowners. If permission is required how will law enforcement deal with it. It will take a lot of time and resources away from more necessary work. Ex. a call comes in from a landowner that a snow machine is on their property .. call is forwarded to an officer. Officer call complainant back, 5- 10 minutes has passed. Officer then drives 5 to 60 minutes to get to the location of the call. Snow machine could now be easily 60 km away in 1 hour. Even if snow machine is observed, how does officer stop it? If for some reason ( really lucky ) they ever get the snow machine stopped what have they done for any damage( stubble is covered by snow) . I really believed that only acreage owners closer to higher population centers have issues. In more remote locations landowners will not want to be bothered. As far as hunting goes I can see many scenarios where a change may be positive and negative. - a person is drawn for antelope/ deer, etc. They observed the animal and attempt to get ahold of the landowner - providing the RM map hasn't changed in the last 3 years and so often happens.</p>
			<p>After finding the landowner they google sask 441 for a phone number and attempt to call the landowner. May take minutes to days to get ahold of the landowner. In the meantime another hunter arrives, observes the antelope, shoots it, guts it, loads it and leaves. The original hunters calls the TIP line, a file is started, Officer speaks with the landowner who is glad the antelope was killed, wants them all killed and does not care that a hunter drove on the stubble field ( what can it hurt). Officer calls TIP caller back and explains landowner not concerned .....matter concluded.... except the hunter that took time to call in has just lost out. I have numerous examples of these types of situations I have observed. ( we have more absentee landowners all the time or big land companies as well with no contact info. I think the local RM offices could see a lot more phone calls as hunters look for ways to contact the landowner. A full scale change could cause a real decrease in hunter numbers and loose a real valuable recreational tool for the Province. On the I phone there is a app called " I Hunter". It would be nice to see hunters that do not want anyone on there land to select the quarters or sections that would apply to them . Many RM's do not allow I Hunter to download the RM maps to allow hunters to know who's land they are close to. It would be nice if all RM had there maps available. 90% of hunters are real good people, its to bad that 10% cause 90% of the problems. The reality is that a change will impact the 90% of the good hunters as they will try to do it right, but if it is not set up property they too will become dismayed with the process.</p>
			<p>the 10% that always cause problems will continue to do so whether the law changes or not, and with so little farm yards ( eyes on the land) and low numbers of Conservation Officers it will be tough. In most cases I have dealt with if a hunter was observed on posted land by a landowner, it plays out like this 90 % of the time. - CO- thanks for the call, we caught him/her. We are going to charge them, but before we do I just want to make sure you would be willing ot go to court, ... ( the accused always says they have permission. so you have to have the landowner present.... at the day of trial the hunter sees the landowner show up, knows he is in trouble now and changes his plea to guilty). Most land owners at this point say " NO" I do not want to go to court so not charge is laid..... the other thing that happens is the landowner has given no one permission and asks who the hunter is. CO tell him it is "Joe Smith" from the nearby town( in most cases the problem hunters live the nearby vicinity). the landowners says I do not want to cause any hard feelings in small town, kid play hockey together, on the church board... or some other connection, so the matter is not dealt with. In the meantime the CO may have spent 2 -3 hours on it. This example will NOT change with new trespass legislation as the landowner will still need to attend court.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All land that is being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>From the most direct route from a main access point. Access to landowners through municipal offices should be considered.</p>	<p>No it does not.</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>There should be a distinction between fenced properties and all others.</p>	<p>Permission should be sought through publicly-available email addresses.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

No. Current system works just fine.	No. All land is the same. Standing crops or swath should be closed to vehicle traffic though.	Telephone numbers or directions to home posted on no hunting signs	Yes. With limited time to hunt and enjoy the outdoors seeking permission of landowners who don't care if people access their land is a waste of time
Yes. Trespassers don't know if other operations are going on on the land like trapping with power snares.	Any privately owned land should be included. Doesn't matter if it's cultivated or not, fenced or not, it still the owners land and it doesn't happen in the urban areas why is it different in the rural	With today's technologies a written or text or email should be good. Or As long as the trespasser can give the land owners info like name and phone number of not written.	No. Private land is not someone else's playground. Permission to play on someone's land.
Yes	treat all the same when used for agricultural purposes.	contact with land owner should be made prior to accessing. Contact by phone, e-mail or most direct route on main access point.	no, its only respectful to ask permission to access private land prior to accessing.
Yes!!!!	Yes!!!	Yes. They should have to have landowner permission and do it by direct to residence or by phone.	No. It would keep recreational users off properties they are not to be on. Such as underseeded or crop out. They should have to have permission before driving all over someone else s property. I feel consent if the main access to the property is not already posted would be adequate enough.
Yes, but how does one contact the owner? I was hunting mule deer a few years ago. I stopped to check out a small herd of mule deer. A truck pulled up beside me. The driver of the truck claimed to own the land and gave me permission to hunt on that land. Afterwards I thought, How do I know that was the landowner? It could have been anyone. Could I be charged with trespassing even though I thought that I had permission to hunt on that land? Could an unethical hunter say that he talked to a guy in a red pickup truck and was given permission?	Land that is enclosed (e.g., fenced) should be treated differently than land that is not. Land that is cultivated but not harvested should be treated like land that is fenced.	Email would be useless because not everyone reads their email in a timely manner. An RM switchboard would only work during business hours. The name and phone number of the landowner could be posted on the land to facilitate access to the landowner.	It can be an impediment when hunting if a wounded animal crosses the road to a piece of property owned by a different person. Quick access to the name and phone number of the landowner would help ease that impediment.
Yes.	All land should be treated the same.	Individuals should be required to obtain permission to have access on all private land.	Making consent an express requirement is needed to reduce confusion over trespass laws. The good practice of seeking permission is often used by "good actors" but the "bad actors" take advantage of this confusion and treat private land as public domain, often not realizing the negative impacts that they may be causing.
No, wildlife is a public resource. This change will lead to a pay to hunt scenario, thus excluding a large number of hunters from being able to participate.	Land access prohibited by notice to that effect is good enough. It's worked well for years.	Depends on the individual situation.	Yes, it definitely would.
Yes definitely	All agriculture land should be treated the Same	Liasson through rm office could possibly work with advance notice	No
Yes			
No	Yes	Verbally	Yes
Yes, unless an emergency.	Should all be treated the same.	Preferably in person. Drive up the driveway to the residence----not cut across property to ask permission to do so.	A so-called impediment to a recreationalist should not take precedent over the land owner's business/livelihood and private property. Hard packed ground, powdery soil, crop disease being spread from field to field. Not to mention gates left open, fences cut and debris. Permission is essential.

<p>It would be nearly impossible to obtain permission in many rural areas as it is difficult to determine who owns or operates the land. With large corporate and private farms owning or operating areas of land scattered over one or more rural municipalities it would be difficult to know who to contact for permission. I reside on a small rural property and do not know the who the neighbouring operator (renter) or corporate landowner is. One can determine the owner from Rm office but i understand that getting contact information is difficult due to privacy concerns.</p>	<p>As a small rural landowner of open pasture land I am not as concerned about trespassing on the open pasture land as I am about my yard. I would suggest stricter trespass legislation to cover any yard site and building structures including houses, garages, machinery storage, grain storage and livestock barns And corrals. I agree cultivated and fenced property should have different consideration. I would suggest that trespass rules should apply to cultivated land during the crop growing/harvesting season. ( I do not agree with the concerns about potentially spreading crop diseases on tires and footwear. While there is a chance of transporting disease in this manner, farmers are likely the worst perpetrators of this. I have yet to see a farmer disinfect machinery when they pull out of one field and drive down the road to the next field. Their neighbouring farmer drives over the same road and may pick up infectious crop diseases on their tires and transfer the disease to their land. Additionally, wildlife is more likely to transfer plant disease than humans as they live in the environment ). I also agree with stricter trespass rules for fenced pasture land if the farmer raises livestock or harvests hay. There should be provisions for no trespass near livestock. I also suggest that in open cultivated fields there should be provisions for no trespass near any machinery on the land.</p>	<p>It is not feasible to get permission on much of the rural land in sask. much of the land is owned by corporations large and small and private individuals. they do not always own large blocks of land, but, rather small areas of a quarter section or half section here and several other quarter/ half sections a mile or two or five or many miles away! It is very difficult to know who owns any parcels of land in rural saskatchewan.</p>	<p>Yes, it would be unreasonable. I am a small rural landowner with open pasture land. I enjoy outdoor recreational activities on my property and am open to others enjoying it for legitimate and safe recreational activities. I think it would be unreasonable to deny everyone access to the open areas as long as they are respectful of my property. If they are not safe or respectful I should be able to ask them to leave the property and there should be a requirement that they comply. However, I think it is reasonable to block access to everyone for yardsite access to provide a safe, secure and private environment for owners.</p>
<p>No. Properly licensed Saskatchewan hunters and anglers should have access to hunt and fish on private land unless that land has been properly posted to prohibit such activity. I want the right to hunt and fish private lands and waters maintained in the law, unless such lands are posted.</p>	<p>All private lands, unless posted, should remain open to hunting and fishing, without prior consent of the owner. The only restriction to that right should be the prohibition against hunting within 500 m of an occupied dwelling.</p>	<p>As a legitimate hunter or angler I should not be required to seek permission from the landowner to carry out such activities unless the land is properly posted. Fencing should not be construed, in law, to constitute posting or a prohibition of entry to legitimate hunters or anglers.</p>	<p>Yes. A hunter or angler will be greatly impeded in their activities as in most cases the owner of the land in question cannot be ascertained without prior research. If the law does not currently expressly permit hunting and angling access on unposted private land, it should be changed to do so.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Written or oral</p>	<p>No. It's private property and should be responsibility of the person wanting access to get permission not that of land owner to keep them off</p>
<p>definitely</p>	<p>all treated the same</p>	<p>written and signed</p>	<p>no it is private property</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>distinctions ought to be made</p>	<p>a process that is clear for both landowner and person wishing to access. email and municipal office provisions would be meaningful</p>	<p>no</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All private property should be the same. If it's not your property, stay off unless granted permission by the owner or occupier</p>	<p>Enter the driveway and knock on the door or a phone call</p>	<p>No it wouldn't. Private property should never be the public's playground</p>
<p>I believe that this restriction should only apply to cultivated acres for bio security. On all lands there should be no vehicle access with out permission. I don't believe there should be any restrictions on non consumptive entrance onto non cultivated acres. ie for people just going for a walk to enjoy nature.</p>	<p>I believe that cultivated land should be restricted to no entrance. Again I think if someone enters pasture or native lands in a non consumptive way then I don't believe they should need prior permission. The example I would use again is someone on a nature walk. At all times there should be no vehicular traffic allowed on these lands of any type with out prior consent.</p>	<p>Can RM maps be put on line so people can see where the land owners yards are? The use of emails and phone numbers(?) at the RM offices would be a good idea I believe. This an area that will have to be monitored and adjusted to find what what works for everyone concerned.</p>	<p>I believe it is reasonable if you are going onto private property with any vehicle or for consumptive purposes (ie. hunting) it is legitimate to make consent a prerequisite. It may be worth while making it mandatory that hunters on private lands are not allowed to drive off roads or trails unless to retrieve game. This restriction I believe would help to reduce the friction between the land owner and people who would like access to private lands for activities such as hunting.</p>
<p>No</p>	<p>There should be a distinction</p>	<p>Email Addresses, municipal offices, landowners could register which activities they allow on their property with the municipal office/website.</p>	<p>Definitely an impediment, what constitutes unreasonable? It might end up very difficult or even impossible to get in touch with certain landowners, they might choose to not respond or might be unavailable, and then it seems unreasonable.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>They should all be the same. Private property is private!</p>	<p>It should be the responsibility of the person wanting access to discover ownership and request permission</p>	<p>No. If you want access to private land you should need to request permission. Groups can get together and establish trails etc with landowners permission, but only if the landowner agrees.</p>

<p>No The RM maps are not up to date every year and there is no list of phone numbers to contact the land owner. The days of a farm every 2 or 3 miles is gone very difficult to communicate. There are provisions in the law right now if you damage private property.</p>	<p>No leave it the way it is.</p>	<p>It should given verbally in person or over the phone if your able to contact the land owner. A lot of them live in the city. I have hunted for over 50 years and never had a problem. If the new Trespass Legislation is passed it will be a huge loss of revenue to the province .It will make it so difficult that the majority of the people that enjoy the sport with there sons,daughters and grandchildren will give it up. It is a nightmare trying to track the land owners down and do the right thing.</p>	<p>Yes I have already answered this question previously.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All rural property should be treated the same for trespass purposes.</p>	<p>It should be up to the individual seeking permission to access the land to determine who controls access and how to contact them. Many responsible and respectful recreationalists are already doing this.</p>	<p>Required consent would not represent and unreasonable impediment to recreational activities.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Private property is exactly that "private property " if no access is granted by the land owner it should be an offence to enter. With penalties that are a deterrent.</p>	<p>The rural government offices are ideally suited to collect data from the land owners as to the granting of access. It could be as simple as a check off on the tax roll if the land owner wishes to opt out of access. the opt out properties could be viewed on line by any one. this would be very economical and non intrusive.</p>	<p>No unreasonable impediment would be realized. It may take a bit of extra effort to gain access but this should not be viewed as unreasonable impediment.</p>
<p>No. There are two parts to the reason for this. The first and most important part is that the public should have a right to reasonable, responsible access to most types of rural land. The second part is that it is often impractical, and in some cases virtually impossible, to get in touch with the land owner/occupier to even ask for permission to access the land in question. Private landowners deserve to have their land and property treated with respect. Theft, mischief, and vandalism are already against the law. Some areas, such as the immediate vicinity of a house or shop aside from a driveway or walkway, machinery yards, gardens, orchards, the portion of fields in which crops are growing or awaiting harvest, and newly seeded pasture should be off-limits to the general public without permission. However, other areas such as brush, forest, or bush land; the unplanted margins of crop fields; mature pasture; frozen fields other than those with overwintering crops (e.g. winter wheat); and waterbodies should be accessible by the public on foot, bicycle, horse, canoe, kayak, or other non-motorized means of transport without the need for permission from the land owner/occupier. Many northern European jurisdictions (e.g. Iceland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Estonia) have variations on such a "right of public access" or "freedom to roam", and in these places much of the public's pride of place is tied to these rights. For instance, in Sweden, "allmansrätten" or the rights and responsibilities of public access, are widely known, respected, and exercised by the public as the core of the culture of outdoor recreational activities. Saskatchewan would do well to thoroughly study these jurisdictions' public access laws and implement a suitable form of them here. One of things that politicians got mostly right at the various stages of the development of Canada and Saskatchewan was that the fish and game in the waters and on the lands of this jurisdiction are public goods to be owned and managed by the public for the public good. This was in contrast to practices in place in many of the European countries from where so many early immigrants to Canada originated where these resources were privately owned and controlled. The public ownership and management of, and access to, wildlife is one of the primary reasons that fishing, hunting, and wildlife viewing have been and continue to be popular activities in Saskatchewan.</p>	<p>There should be a distinction made between two groups of property types based on considerations for the privacy of the home of the land owner/occupier and the actual sensitivity of the property to damage by the activity in question. Some areas, such as the immediate vicinity of a house or shop aside from a driveway or walkway, machinery yards, gardens, orchards, the portion of fields in which crops are growing or awaiting harvest, and newly seeded pasture should be off-limits to the general public without permission. However, other areas such as brush, forest, or bush land; the unplanted margins of crop fields; mature pasture; frozen fields other than those with overwintering crops (e.g. winter wheat); and waterbodies should be accessible by the public on foot, bicycle, horse, canoe, kayak, or other non-motorized means of transport without the need for permission from the land owner/occupier. The presence or not of a fence should make no difference to how these places are classified.</p>	<p>First of all, as I previously explained in response to earlier questions, permission should not be required in many circumstances â€" see those answers for that explanation. Where permission is required, it should be able to be sought without undue difficulty. Currently, the act of seeking permission from land owners/occupiers is often fraught with problems that greatly reduce its practicality. First of all, many rural municipalities only make their RM maps available to the public in the form of printed maps, and to obtain one a person must either send a cheque in the mail in order to have a map mailed back, or visit the RM office during their business hours to buy a map in person. For those residing any significant distance from the RM or having a job that requires one to remain onsite during RM business hours, this all but eliminates the chance of attempting to contact the land owner/occupier remotely unless one knows where one wants to go at least a week in advance. These maps are not updated continuously as land changes hands â€" sometimes the most recent one available will be two or three years old. Upon receipt of an RM map, the next challenge is finding contact information for the land owner/occupier.</p>	<p>Yes. Many of the rivers in southern Saskatchewan are bordered by private land. Consider the case of people going on a canoe trip on a river. On such trips, weather, current, and other variables make it difficult to know where exactly one will need to stop along the way. If the proposed changes to trespass regulations are made, anyone stopping along the side of the river for whatever reason (e.g. for lunch, to seek shelter from a storm, to camp, etc.) could easily be fined for trespassing unless they had obtained prior express permission from the owner/occupier of the land along the river. Since the canoeists would not know in advance where they would be stopping along the river, their only way to be safe would be to seek permission in advance from every land owner/occupier along their rout, which could easily extend for hundreds of kilometers. Not many driveways to the houses of owners/occupiers of land bordering rivers go from the riverbank to the front door, so any provision that requires people to seek access permission by the driveway only would be impractical in such situations. Consider a situation of a hunter hunting on land for which he or she has been granted permission to hunt. They shoot a deer and it runs onto adjacent land for which the hunter cannot get in contact with the land owner/occupier. In that situation, the hunter is bound by one law to make every effort to retrieve the animal in order to not let it go to waste, and by another law to not set foot on the adjacent land without express permission.</p>

<p>Curtailling physical access to the places where these activities can take place is a major step backwards for the province. As the supply of Crown land is shrinking (especially in the southern half of the province) through sales to private individuals and businesses, public control of this land, especially with regards to sustaining various forms of wild plant and animal life, is being eroded. If trespassing laws become even stricter and in favour of the land owner/occupier, as the proposal in this review is contemplating, there will come a time in the not too distant future where hunting, fishing, hiking, paddling, nature viewing, etc. outside of parks and vacant Crown land will be largely restricted to those fortunate enough to own rural property or be well connected to those who do. In other words, we will be approaching the old western European situation controlled by and for the privileged few that the forefathers and mothers of our country and province worked hard to avoid recreating on this side of the Atlantic. The act of seeking permission from land owners/occupiers is often fraught with problems that greatly reduce its practicality. First of all, many rural municipalities only make their RM maps available to the public in the form of printed maps, and to obtain one a person must either send a cheque in the mail in order to have a map mailed back, or visit the RM office during their business hours to buy a map in person. For those residing any significant distance from the RM or having a job that requires one to remain onsite during RM business hours, this all but eliminates the chance of attempting to contact the land owner/occupier remotely unless one knows where one wants to go at least a week in advance. These maps are not updated continuously as land changes hands "sometimes the most recent one available will be two or three years old. Upon receipt of an RM map, the next challenge is finding contact information for the land owner/occupier. For land owned by a natural person, the prevalence of mobile phones with numbers not listed in phone books/directories has made it increasingly difficult to find phone numbers. In other cases where land is owned by a business, some owners hide behind lawyers with power of attorney that will not disclose who the owner or even the occupier of the land is due to a claim of solicitor-client privilege.</p>		<p>For land owned by a natural person, the prevalence of mobile phones with numbers not listed in phone books/directories has made it increasingly difficult to find phone numbers. In other cases where land is owned by a business, some owners hide behind lawyers with power of attorney that will not disclose who the owner or even the occupier of the land is due to a claim of solicitor-client privilege. Land ownership information (e.g. RM maps) should be readily available to the public without charge for the information. In the 21st century, that means freely available in useful formats (e.g. .PDF, .geoPDF, .geoTIFF, web map tile services, etc.) from a centralized database (e.g. provincial government website) on the internet. In addition to the ability to pick up RM maps from the RM office, it should be possible to order paper copies online or offline from a central location (i.e. one distribution centre for the whole province) for prices that reflect the actual cost of printing the map. This type of reform needs to happen regardless of what comes out of this review of trespassing regulations. Contact information (e.g. telephone numbers, email addresses, mailing addresses, physical addresses) for land owners/occupiers should be made available to those seeking permission for access.</p> <p>In a similar practice as the provincially mandated labelling requirements for ice fishing shacks, land owners should be required to post, at the corners of each quarter section bordering a road or road allowance, a sign clearly showing their name, address, and phone number. If enforcement officers are going to patrol and issue tickets without first checking with the land owner/occupier to see if the supposed trespasser was given permission, then written permission is the only realistic way for land owners/occupiers to grant permission for access. If tickets are only going to be issued on a specific complaint-driven basis, then it can be left up to land owners/occupiers and the member of the public accessing their land to decide on which form (verbal, written, etc.) of permission they are comfortable with. In any case, it should be possible for land owners/occupiers who wish to make their land open to the public to post a notice to that effect and that notice alone should suffice as proof of permission for access.</p>	<p>An enforcement officer could fine the hunter for retrieving the deer, even if the landowner on whose land the deer fell would have granted permission after the fact. Especially given the problems (detailed in my responses to previous questions) that already exist with (a) finding out who actually owns/controls a piece of land, (b) finding contact information for that person (natural or otherwise), and (c) getting in touch with that person to seek access permission, requiring prior express permission for access regardless of the activity is a major burden. Just think about somebody who wants to go for a day hike along a valley or over a high ridge 150 km from their home "that person would have to decide on a route at least 10 days ahead of time, send for the RM map and wait for it to arrive in the mail, then spend hours trying to find contact information for the dozen or more land owner/occupiers along the route, then modify the route when they cannot get in touch with one landowner in the middle of the route, all for a hike that left no trace other than some footprints in the sand. This is overkill. A system such as Scotland's or Sweden's, where reasonable and responsible public access to most types of private land is enshrined in law would make much more sense and actually encourage the public to take part in recreational activities in rural areas rather than discouraging it and making what should be an enjoyable experience a headache. Governments bemoan the depopulation of rural areas; imposing barriers to reasonable public access to rural land is not the way to encourage people from urban or rural areas to feel welcome exploring the many wonderful places Saskatchewan has to offer.</p>
<p>Definitely all access by the public should have landowners permission no matter what the activity; And if entered without permission that should constitute an offense.</p>	<p>All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same; The land is privately owned and taxes are paid by landowners .</p>	<p>A phone number could be left at RM offices so that people could call the landowner. 99% of people have and carry a cell phone so there is no excuse. Email is touchy since not all people have access to email off their mobile device.</p>	<p>I do not see how it can be unreasonable since there is no legal entitlement as it is; The only thing that happens if people think they can go all over private property is the landowner not granting any access and hard feelings for all.</p>
<p>Getting permission would be in order but failure to comply, should not constitute an offence.</p>	<p>All should be treated the same</p>	<p>Determine the name of landowner which can be done with a municipal map &amp; call landowner for permission.</p>	<p>yes</p>
<p>Yes.</p>	<p>All should be treated the same. Ask to go on land because they're could be someone working there that you don't know about. Especially hunters.</p>	<p>Ask the person farming the land for permission. They can contact the landowner if they think they need to.</p>	<p>It's just fine if you gotta ask to trespass.</p>
<p>yes</p>	<p>no. All private property is the same. rural or urban</p>	<p>the same way you would ask to enter property in the city. knock on the door. write a letter use a phone.the same logic applies whether in a rural area or urban area. if you can not do it on property in the city you can not do it in a rural area. Posting personal information in public is no more acceptable in rural areas than it would be in an urban area</p>	<p>there maybe no legal entitlement to access private property but there is implied entitlement to access private property as the law stands now. the fact that you must post your property to prevent someone from believing they have the right to access your property is an impediment on your property rights. access should require permission. do I have the implied right to use other people's property unless they have expressly posted the it may not be accessed. such as atvs snowmobiles. I think not and rightly so. This change would not represent an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities.</p>

YES	ALL LAND THAT IS OWNED BY OTHERS SHOULD BE TREATED THE SAME IRREGARDLESS OF WHAT IT IS BEING USED FOR. WOODED LAND IN THE NORTH SHOULD BE TREATED THE SAME AS PASTURE LAND. IF IT'S NOT YOUR LAND AND YOU DON'T HAVE PERMISSION, STAY OFF. LANDOWNERS HAVE BOUGHT AND PAID FOR THIS LAND, SO IT SHOULD BE THEIR CHOICE IF PEOPLE ARE TO ACCESS OR NOT. THEY SHOULDN'T HAVE TO POST TO KEEP OTHERS OFF. LOT OWNERS IN THE CITY DON'T POST 'NO TRESSPASSING' ON THEIR FRONT LAWNS.	MUNICIPALITY MAPS ARE AVAILABLE AT ALL RM OFFICES. LANDOWNERS SHOULD LEAVE A CONTACT NUMBER AT THE RM OFFICES THAT INDIVIDUALS COULD USE TO CONTACT LANDOWNER FOR PERMISSION. THERE COULD BE A LIST OF CONTACT INFO ALONG WITH THE MAP. IF NO CONTACT FOR A CERTAIN LANDOWNER, THEN NO PERMISSION GRANTED, OTHERWISE PERMISSION COULD BE GRANTED OVER THE PHONE. THIS WOULD BE BENEFICIAL IN SITUATIONS WHERE AND OWNERS DON'T PHYSICALLY LIVE NEAR THEIR PROPERTY. ALSO FOR EXAMPLE I LIVE ON MY OWN PROPERTY, BUT NOT USUALLY HOME DURING PEAK HUNTING HOURS. I COULD BE REACHED BY PHONE. PRIOR SITUATIONS HAVE AROSE DUE TO NO ONE HOME AND PERMISSION IS ASSUMED WHEN THERE HAS BEEN CATTLE AND OCCUPIED BUILDINGS NEARBY. KEEPS COMMUNICATION LINES	AS A LANDOWNER AND ACTIVE ATV'ER & SNOWMOBILER, MY ACTIVITIES BEING IMPEDED DOESN'T EVEN COME INTO QUESTION. WITH PROPER PERMISSION LAW, THIS WOULD BE A NON-ISSUE. WHY DO PEOPLE THINK THEY CAN ACCESS OTHERS PEOPLE PROPERTY WITHOUT PERMISSION. COULD YOU IMAGINE THE PROBLEMS THAT WOULD BE CREATED IF I RUTTED UP SOMEONES SOD LAWN IN SASKATOON WITH MY QUAD, BUT ITS OK FOR SOMEONE TO DRIVE ACROSS MY FIELD TO PLAY IN A MUDHOLE AND NOW I HAVE RUTS THAT I HAVE SMOOTH BEFORE I CAN USE THIS LAND I PAID FOR, OR THE COST OF DESTROYED CROP? I HAVE PERMISSION - THEN I ACCESS, I DON'T HAVE PERMISSION-I DON'T ACCESS. MAKES THE PROCESS EASIER AND GETS RID OF THE 'GREY AREA' THAT CAUSES ALL THE CONFLICT.
Yes, but only for land that is under cultivation.	There should be a distinction between cultivated land and pasture land. And it should be made clear that public roadways can be used by everyone and are not part of the Trespass Legislation.	It is often difficult to know who owns the land one might want to access for birdwatching, as one example. Anything that makes this easier would be helpful, and providing contact information through municipal offices should be considered in addition to allowing a direct approach to an inhabited residence.	This would not be unreasonable as long as the methods of gaining permission are easy to achieve. Perhaps digital publication of maps for RMs that show the name and contact information for landowners in the RM would be a convenient way to do this.
Yes indeed any access to any non owned land should have permission granted PRIOR to gaining ANY and ALL ACCESS. I have seen hunters ignore NO HUNTING or NO TRESSPASSING signs. In fact drive right past the sign just missing it with the rear veiw mirror. They can not say they did not see it.	ALL LAND SHOULD HAVE THE SAME TREATMENT. This cuts down seriously on any possible variances. This would leave NO HOLES.	ALL land owners no matter who, what or where should have the absolute ability to grant access to ALL land.	NO. Opening avenues leaves the law open to to possible abusive occurrences. One plain and simple access consent or denial situation leaves less variables.
Yes	All land used for agriculture, treated equally	Access through RM office administration.	No, it would however breed respect and responsibility of recreational activity users.
No.	All lands should be treated the same. When I hunt in the winter, cops are off and the ground is frozen.	It is difficult to know who's land belongs to who. Some land is posted to be hunted "with permission only" yet there is rarely a ph# to contact. Encouraging a contact number, even in an rm office is encouraged.	Yes it does impede hunting activities. Often there is a lot of ground covered when hunting, and one doesn't know where the animals will be today. Searching for landowner permission uses up a large part of the day. I do believe in walking in and walking out, no vehicles on private land.
Entry onto land should NOT in and of itself constitute an offence. The right to wander should be maintained unless land is clearly marked as No Trespassing or some other wording to such effect. Several modifications or minor modifications could be made which would alleviate land owner concerns: 1. Lands within close proximity to residences would be off limits without landowner/occupant permission. 2. Entry onto other lands would be restricted to foot access only. Care needs to be taken that Trespass Law does not in effect encourage individuals to protect their land as armed conclaves yet have the ability to make their person safe. We do not want to see people taking the law into their own hands beyond asking someone to leave their land.	I think cultivated land and land that is a lawn, garden, or in direct proximity of an occupied residence should be treated differently then land used for pasture or hay (annual forage such as alfalfa). All land could be restricted to foot access only unless retrieving legally taken game or with permission.	IF permission to access land, consideration needs to be given such that the public has access, in the field, to the information required to obtain access (phone number, home address).	Regardless of the activity I don't agree that all lands should be restricted. As a general comment, care also needs to be exercised to ensure that in no way would Trespass Legislation restrict otherwise legal access such as under disposition, legislation (i.e. Power Corporation Act), or the ability for law enforcement to enter upon land (not residence) in the legal execution of duties. It is important that and Trespass Legislation does not sow the seeds to create an environment where individuals are protecting their property in the same manner as their person.
Nope	Lawn or gardens are understandable and if an owner has a good reason for keeping people out.	Should there be an easy way to call a land owner?	It would definitely be an impediment. Especially if a hunter gets drawn in a zone away from their residence. They would have to observe the area and track down the landowners for permission.

yes	there should be no distinction between types of land	Legitimate efforts to seek consent are welcome no matter the style. Unfortunately legitimate efforts may not always be successful. This is not different to trying to find a homeowner in the city. Sometimes they are home sometimes they are not. That is just life.	Making consent an express requirement is a tool that a landowner can use to protect the property from the new dangers that have come to the forefront of agriculture. Invasive plants, animals and disease. Therefore it is not an unreasonable impediment to recreational activities
Yes	Yes	Ask land owners or land operators.	No
On private land - YES. On crown (publicly owned) land - NO. These lands should have Public Notice signs at access points allowing use by the public for low impact, non-motorized activities such as hiking, nature viewing, berry picking, picnicking, cross country skiing. Access for consumptive activities like hunting, fishing should be regulated through The Wildlife Act - including vehicle use of designated trails or no motor vehicle use - with appropriate Public Notice signs at access points to the crown lands.	All private land should be treated the same. Permission required to access it. All Crown land should be treated as described previously. General permission for the public to access crown lands for low impact non consumptive activities; specific restrictions for vehicle entry and consumptive uses (hunting) on a site by site basis.	Seek access via RM office contacts or through direct contact (phone or to the residence), or via neighbours who would know ownership details. Owners may choose to grant permission verbally or in writing, with the person requesting providing vehicle description/licence plate number/home phone contact details.	No, and No. I have had the participants of an organized snowmobile rally cross my fenced quarter of land without contacting me or having my permission. They assumed a neighbour who had told them "it would be OK" was enough for them to cross my land. I have had bear hunters using ATVs access my land presumably to find a location for setting up a bait station for hunting.
No the land should be posted first	No it should all be the same	In person	Yes it would take days of seeking permission before being able to do the activity
Yes	All land treated the same .	Phone ,text, email in person.	No.
yes	all land should be treated the same	normal means. government agencies do it all the time. Statistics Canada, Revenue Canada, Sask Power, Sask Tel, Sask Energy,Etc. Etc.	No
Yes	It should all be treated the same.	I think it can be both sought and granted by a simple phone call , by electronic text or e mail or by written permission . I just want to know who will be out there , when and why .	In some cases it might . I am a photographer and on occasion it would not be possible to get permission to access land . Photo opportunities often arise unexpectedly and a change in light or location ( or having an animal run away ) can ruin a photo opportunity
no not allot of landlords and farmers went to war for a free country , they stayed home farming . The landless town boys , city boys did the job overseas for rights to use and walk on the land they defended. this law is for selfish farmers and the politicians that want their vote.	no all should be free to enter	no permission in a free country	no
yes...advance and written permission	I own the land.. how I use it is none of your business...it is still for my use...NOT YOURS	permission by written letter, or POSSIBLY an email could work too	who evers name is on the land title, and pays the taxes is the ONLY ONE who has a right to be on the land without permission
yes	no distinction	written, email, accompany them	no...I had a relative who was " invading " vacated rural properties looking for antiques...she bragged about taking her camera with her so if someone caught them, they could just say they were taking pictures of old farm buildings. GRRRRRRR
Yes,most definitely	All land used for any agricultural purposes should be treated the same	Permission should be sought first by telephone or text permission but best is written notice	No because if you don't own the land you have No Right TO BE ON THE LAND FOR ANY RESON
Yes	All land	In person	No
yes	treat all agriculture land the same	that is up to the landowner, verbal or written or any way that the owner feels fit.	for all activities, except on foot for tracking wounded game in hunting

No I do not agree with this new proposed legislation.	Access should be given to all land unless the land is posted by the landowner. The onus should be on the landowner to post land that he does not want people to trespass on.	With fewer landowners who own larger tracts of land it is much more difficult to know who to get permission from. Some are companies with managers. On the RM maps the land may be listed by number with no listing. Too complicated to get permission. Too much regulation. Change is not needed. Larger farms with fewer rural farmyards actually makes hunting and snowmobiling safer for the ones doing it and the rural residents. I am afraid that outfitters will tie up the land with written permission for Americans and other clients and the local Saskatchewan people will not have the opportunity. We see this in some areas with goose hunting.	Certainly an unreasonable impediment for snowmobiling, hunting etc. Would perhaps have fewer which would have economic impact on dealers, service stations, cafes and other rural businesses. Who would enforce this? Fewer COs with larger areas and more responsibilities added over the years, and the RCMP are busy. Concentrate on real rural crime and not make citizens have to break regulations that are not enforceable to do the outdoor activities that they enjoy. Most farmers do not want the hassle of many snowmobilers and hunters trying to get permission especially during harvest so this would be a big impediment. There is less crown land to hunt on with the sale of the community pastures so that is already impacting the situation. Some lakes and crown land is surrounded by private land - how would one get there if a direct route would require numerous written permissions. I believe this is government regulating our lives for individuals to pursue recreation in favour of the lobby for a few. How would wildlife be managed if Canadian/Saskatchewan hunters are restricted access. I think that this would lead to more SGI wildlife claims. Also I have always believed that landowners should not be given wildlife compensation if land is posted especially in this proposed legislation. It is the farmers land so if he has a problem with access/trespassing, just post the land. There are always a few who break this, but don't make the honest people start ignoring regulations too by putting in unneeded and unenforceable legislation.
Yes if proper signage is clearly visible and a contact number is supplied. Otherwise entrance to the dwelling is required for permission.	Yes. Cultivated land must be clearly posted. To non-rural people is there a difference between summer fallow vs cultivated? Is there a water shore rights if one wades or floats down a river or stream and lands on private property which is not clearly posted?	Online rural municipal map indicating posted and non posted land with the proper permission method is required for access.	No. What I have not seen specifically is the use of drones whether it be for the use of agricultural uses, recreational uses or for hunting which I would deem illegal.
Yes. We are constantly bothered by trespassers in our cattle pastures that shoot random things for fun(wildlife, bottles, etc), leave garbage/shell casings and leave gates wide open. And then we're supposedly at fault if one of cows gets hit on the highway... complete bs. People should have to directly ask for permission to enter any private property they do not own.	Same	People should be offered the ability to have their contact info (of their choosing) listed next to a complete municipal map of current landowners. If they choose not to disclose contact info, their property should still be identified on the map with their name but with the contact info simply as "not listed"	Only during the transition period. Once people get used to it, people will build on the properties they have gained permission to access. For example, a snowmobiler/hunter asks and attains permission from 2 farmers in 2018 and in 2019 he'll likely be granted access again and can ask another 2 people if he wants to go elsewhere.
Yes when the fields are in production or have crop left over winter. Snowmobile should require permission providing that no damage results. Always have permission for hunting	The only difference should be weather it contains either (crop/livestock) or not	Phone call or email. Having them enter the yard is a liability	
Absolutely	It should be treated the same. None of these have any lower risk of being damaged by trespassers.	Enhanced access through municipal offices is a great idea. But also, having phone numbers on 'access by permission only' signs is an obvious method. MoE used to give out signs like this.	I guess that is dependent on how you define unreasonable. Landowners think it is unreasonable to have hunters shooting at their livestock, and quads ripping up their cropland and grassland. How are you going to prevent that if you provide access without permission? Of course it is not an unreasonable impediment to have to obtain permission. If all recreationalists were respectful users of the land we would not be having this debate.
yes	should all be treated the same	through municipal offices owners or occupiers could be identified then contacted	no it would not be unreasonable. No more than calling a hotel to book a room
Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Yes	Yes	In person, writing, email, phone.	No
No I do not agree...too many rural lands are occupied by renters and the owners live far away with no way to find who they are. Renters have little or no long term ethic for the lands so should not regulate access to it.	Should all be treated the same.	Electronic would be fine with public posting of contact information from landowners being mandatory. If no response to e-mail or text then consent is implied and original e-mail asking for consent is adequate evidence of compliance.	This express requirement in all circumstances is an unreasonable impediment.
I do not agree. With the amount of land that farmers own it would be almost impossible to determine who even owns the land. It would deter me from buying a hunting license and do any kind of hunting in Saskatchewan	All agricultural land should be treated the same	Land should be Posted with name and contact information	Yes definitely.

Rural property is Treaty land; therefore, I do not think the "land owner" should have the rights to give permission to who is/isn't on their property.	There should be distinctions in the legislation.	It is not safe for people to access rural property via main access points and approach an inhabited residence. This was clearly proven in the Colten Boushie case. If legislation requires permission, there needs to be a safe way to request permission, via both email and phone.	Yes. As previously mentioned, it is not safe for people to approach rural homes. If prior consent is required, there needs to be an off-site way to handle these requests ahead of time.
yes			
No.	I feel there should be a distinction. Do agree with Alberta's Petty Trespass Act.	If land is posted, then some form of contact should be included.	Yes. Absolutely.
No	No	Verbal and or text	Probably, who are we getting consent from the land owner, or the person farming the land the renter?
No. Not all land is owned by people who occupy the land. Absentee owners could effectively exclude the public from hunting opportunity simply by not being there and not responding to requests. The current laws work well when landowners post their expectations.	Treat all land the same.	The current way works! Either you go and knock on doors, or you use an RM map to determine who owns what and then you try and find the landowner.	YES! Such an approach requires the recreationist to have an exact plan of where they intend to spend their daily activities - it is an impediment to exploring terra firma.
Yes .... However how is it possible to determine the owner occupier in every case.	Treat the same		
Yes	All the same	By phone or by personal contact	No
Yes	It should all be treated the same. Private property is private property. It doesn't matter how much you own or what you use it for.	Any way is fine. Verbal is adequate. Texting, emails..... once communication is established there are very few problems. It's anonymity that allows bad behaviour.	No. It's just a phone call. For hunting, you have to get gear ready, get licenses... For 4x4ing, sledding, you need licenses, equipment prep... If that preparation doesn't impede the fun, neither should a phone call to the guy who owns the land. If you play tennis, you book a court. Hockey, you book a rink. You can't just charge on the ice regardless of what else is going on. It's just normal, courteous behaviour to make arrangements to use property that isn't your own.
yes	all land should be treated the same	by calling the land owner	no
Yes should Ned permission	Land is land	Any way at all is better than we got. Last year a company wanted permission. After the phone call I text it to them. At least had showed contact. But this was for access to look at things.	People need to have there ducks in a row
yes	all land treated the same		
Yes.	No. Anyone accessing property for which they are not the owners or occupiers, should have express permission from the landowners/occupiers prior to access.	Phone first. Email could be an appropriate secondary method of contact.	I think land ownership should trump recreation. Express access will certainly affect the way some activities take place (ie. quad rally) but as a land owner, quad rallies are exactly the type of activity that I want to ensure never occur on my property. Most people out for a quad ride perhaps don't understand the negative effect their actions have on soil erosion, the spread invasive weeds (ie. Spurge), dugout/dam banks, the ecological integrity of my property as well as structural improvements (ie. fences, corrals, gates), or their effect on my animals (herding, unintentional stampeding).
No, I believe this would be very detrimental to recreational activities such as hunting, fishing, bird watching, photography, etc.	If there was such a distinction, I think it should be for cultivated land that has standing crop or swaths. Cultivated land that has already be harvested, shouldn't have restrictions. Likewise, for fenced pasture land, any access restriction should only apply when livestock are actually present. This would more closely match the "unwritten rules" followed by ethical hunters.	It would be really great if there was an easy way to ask for permission. Sometimes it is really difficult to track-down the landowners. I would love it if email was an option for this. In Montana, the "Block Management Areas" allow a person to obtain permission by filling-out a permission slip and dropping it in a box in a public area near the hunting areas. This is a really nice option.	I believe would be a big impediment. This could be mitigated somewhat if there was a system in place that enables an easy way to ask for permission.

<p>No. Much of Saskatchewan rural land is owned by corporations who rent it to be farmed. There is literally no way to get permission to legally hunt. Also, even farms with resident owners can be as large as twenty or more sections and finding where to go for permission is extremely difficult, especially if the municipal maps don't have the correct location. Given the large amount of land with no people inhabiting it, special legislation could make it much easier for both landowners and hunters to follow the law. For example, with no livestock and no unharvested crop and no risk to the environment or humans, why would a landowner need to post it? I think that given a lot more in depth thought our laws could work better for everyone. I'm</p>	<p>Definitely a distinction. Harvested cultivated land should be treated differently than land with crop still on it and land with livestock occupying it should be no hunting automatically. Driving across stubble should not be allowed when hunting. Roads or on foot should be necessary.</p>	<p>It should be obvious that a person must be allowed to drive up to a home on a farm just to be able to ask for permission. In my experience I have found land owners to be extremely reasonable. If they don't give permission they have had good reason. You can not stop someone entering private land with intention to steal or damage just by harsh punishing legislation. How long is it going to take to look realistically at that and stop passing ineffectual laws? What difference is there between a person walking up and ringing a household doorbell on a farm or in a city?</p>	<p>Absolutely. There are many circumstances where it is a waste of time for both landowner and hunter..</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Reverse posting: if landowner is willing to grant access, there would be a sign posted to that effect, with contact information. All access by vehicle by public road unless expressly permitted. May go as far as requiring written permission to be carried?</p>	<p>Yes, express consent would represent an impediment, although not unreasonable. The activities described - snowmobiles, atvs, hunting, are destructive to the environment. Some landowners view themselves as caretakers of the land and all its inhabitants. There is nothing unreasonable about having that as a priority over the "rights" of another to trample the complex fabric of the natural environment. There is a duty to share the privilege of care taking the land with others that have an appreciation for similar values. Consent and welcome should be extended where warranted.</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>All land should be treated the same. Regardless of use or whether there is a fence around it or not.</p>	<p>by A personal visit or call.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Yes</p>	<p>No. Ask before going out</p>	<p>Phone (least preferred), in person or email</p>	<p>They should all ask before entering someone's property.</p>
<p>No. Rural landowners can be hard to track down - esp. absentee ones. Accessing and using rural property is already regulated.</p>	<p>Not sure. I would say don't make the law too complicated.</p>	<p>Right. This is REALLY hard. In the RM where I live, a lot of landowners are not there or hard to track down because they own a LOT of parcels but only live on one (or in town). If I am out on my ATV and want to cut from one trail to another, but cross private land... I could spend days or weeks trying to find that landowner. If he/she does not want me on the land, a simple sign that says "private property, do not enter" or "no ATVs" would suffice. I respect all posted signs.</p>	<p>Yes!</p>
<p>No. This would significantly increase the challenge for hunters of locating and contacting landowners. It would also create a significant bureaucratic time-suck for landowners servicing such requests. The end result would be landowners denying access to the land simply to prevent the bother of being asked for permission. Onus should be on the landowners not wishing to provide access to appropriately post their properties, and possibly to detail conditions of access (e.g. hunt on foot only) on the posted signs. Properties not posted are understood to have permission to access.</p>	<p>All property used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.</p>	<p>A single regimented approach to access permission is too inflexible, and is likely to force landowners to deny any permission. Landowners who wish to limit permission, should be empowered to provide such limits through conditions provided on their signs posted on the property. Examples include providing on the sign their phone or email information for verbal or electronic permission, or their home land location if they wish to have in-person, written permission.</p>	<p>Making consent an express requirement in all circumstances would significantly reduce the ability of the public to engage in recreational activities, would significantly concentrate the public's engagement in those activities on a smaller subset of lands with increased risk of impacts (e.g. reduced game populations due to increased harvest pressure) which would further curtail recreational activities, which overall would represent an unreasonable impediment.</p>

no the landowners can posted all their land if they dont want anyone enter their property otherwise it will be hunting on foot only and not allow Atv or snowmobile all year around unless they have permission.	no open pasture land should be treated as natural land	the landowners must put up signs at all four corners and enter gate with valid phone number and address for the public to call for permission	all private land should be enter on foot only for any outdoor activities from hunting to birding unless it is posted. all ATV and snowmobil must enter with permission only. this legislation will damage the local economy from selling gas to AtV and hunting licenses. all major water bodies and river must have direct public access for recreational users. all public shoreline must be fenced off to keep cattle away and being cultivated illegally. all road allowance must be fenced off and clearly identified by sign for public access and stop all illegal cultivation and grazing on all public road allowance.
Yes, absolutely. The landowner owns the rights to that property. They should be able to decide who gets to enter that land. As an agronomist, it has become clear to me how quickly weeds and diseases can spread and anyone entering the land can be spreading these. RM maps are easily accessible to anyone that wants to enter the are; those can be used to identify who owns the land and who to contact about entering it. An offence should be constituted if permission is not granted and the property is entered anyways. You are not allowed to enter someone's house without permission, you should not be able to enter their land either.	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. Property is property, no matter what it is being used for. Again, if diseases and weeds are being spread by trespassers, the property value can be significantly decreased and this impacts the owner of that property. Even if diseases/weeds that affect crops are being spread to pasture land, there is not guarantee that that land will not be used for cropping in the future and that crop will be affected. Many soil borne diseases (such as clubroot) can stay dormant in the soil for a long time, so future crops can be affected if the property changes purposes down the road. Furthermore, pastureland is used for living animals; these living animals deserve not to be startled by strangers entering the land or shot at by hunters. Fences are easily broken by trespassers and this creates unnecessary work for the owner of that property.	RM maps should state who the owner of each piece of land is and their primary contact number. Anyone that wants to enter land can access these maps and contact the owner listed. The maps could even be posted online so that the RM Offices do not need to be open for these maps to be accessible. Written consent from the owner may be necessary to prove right of passage. A form could be made that is filled out by the owner and the person wishing access to that land. It should state the date, length of time they are allowed on the property, how they will be accessing the property (vehicle, quad, walking, etc), their purpose for being on the land, where they are from, list all persons that will be accessing the property, and should be signed by both parties.	Absolutely not. Anyone that wishes to take part in recreational activities can do so on their own land or on designated trails. Crops and fences can be damaged by ATV's and snowmobiles. ATV's can spread weed seeds and diseases, and snowmobiles can cause snow to melt unevenly, causing losses to crop land. Anyone wishing to enter someone else's property for recreational reasons can seek permission before entering another person's property. Again, an individual would not partake in recreational activities in someone else's back yard without permission; recreational activities on rural land should be no different.
No. Regard must be given if land is posted, however if land is not posted responsible hunting should be allowed	no. posted vs not posted should be the guide	there needs to be a mechanism for knowing who owns the land and a way to contact individuals	yes the changes could severely impede activities.
no.as a land owner if I don,t want people on my land I ll post it	All the same	A simple phone call	yes
no access	the same	no access unless permission granted	no
No for the purposes of hunting you might as well shut the seasons. Landowners complain of damage from game and want open seasons yet restrict access. The two don't go hand in hand. Keep it as posting required to keep out hunters but maybe restrict it that no vehicles are allowed . The vehicles are what cause the problems and would keep most unlawful activities to a minimum . People that actually walk to hunt generally aren't out to break the law.	Yes	Email would be all right but I think most landowners want to see who they give permission to you. Problem is not always easy to find out who the landowners are and I think they will be overloaded with requests if this goes through and not answer the phone or the door	Yes it will. It's almost impossible to know exactly where you might end up hunting on any given day. Some hunting zones might cover numerous RMs and hundreds of landowners , where do you even start to get permission
No. Hard to enforce since snowmobiling etc is done in winter with no signs etc. If posted then yes	Same		Yes it would but extremely hard to enforce with both parties
Yes.	It should all be treated the same (protecting hay land, planted trees, fall seeding, is important to consider too). Plus, none of it is their land.	Written permission. Regularly updated RM maps online with contact information for owners if permission is a possibility. If not, their contact will not be on the map.	No. Right now atv'rs, snowmobilers and hunters are an impediment to our farming livelihood. daily life and family activities.
Yes	All treated the same	Written and signed	No. With crop diseases such as club root this must happen. Recreational activities on recreational land.
Yes	All land should be treated the same.	Permissions should be sought via telephone, email, mail or other electronic means but should not include entering the property to seek verbal permission.	Atv-ers, snowmobiles, hunters and others recreational users and a huge part of the problem and should not have the expressed right to enter any private property without first obtaining permission.
Yes	All the same.	Written permission	No

No. Much of the rural properties are not occupied so locating owners is very difficult, in some cases they are located in a near by town or village. In many instances owners are in a city and not reachable.	There are significant differences. Cultivated land in many instances is used from spring to harvest and is idle from September to May. Crops such as winter wheat are an exception and would be considered under cultivation. Common sense and respect should indicate to avoid damaging access when under cultivation. The current practice of posting seems adequate as it balances the interests of landowners and those who benefit from access.		Yes For hunting, the habitat which supports wildlife isn't owned by a single person and often spans across multiple properties. Consent for stretches is difficult since wildlife are themselves nomadic. Restricted access caused by lack of consent may result in a culture of road hunting which benefits neither party. The current access to unposted land supports our rich cultural history of hunting and fishing. Without simple respectful access our children will not have the opportunity to experience nature or appreciate the responsibility that comes access.
yes	all land	some form of proof, i.e., a text or email or written permission, all from landowner or leasee	No, there is plenty of public land in Sask and if someone isn't willing to take the time to ask for permission to cross someone's property then they should be ticketed.
Yes the landowner consent should be a requirement of access	Landowner consent should be required before entering all ag property	Email is a good way. Also provides proof of asking and consent or no consent	No. The current law puts the burden on landowners with no recourse on damage. There's already issues with trail damage and fence issues with the public thinking they can go anywhere at anytime.
Yes	All land should be treated the same. It is my ownership regardless of usage	Phone, in person or written consent from the land owner or renter	I don't think so. It is a privilege to be on my property not a right. I have worked hard to have ownership and others should respect this. If someone has a city/town lot their expectancy is that it is not public property for anyone to trespass on.
Yes. The current requirement for posting places an undue burden on the landowner to densely post land that they do not want the general public to enter. Even then, these postings are frequently ignored.	As in Ontario there should be no distinction. Owned land is owned land and it is not difficult in the age of easy access to information to determine who owns a parcel to gain permission to enter. Invasive species and diseases can reside as easily in a garden setting as a field setting.	Agreed. Access should be gained via in person contact, telephone or written request. If a person crosses a parcel via a non-designated access route the damage is already done with respect to bio-security. Many RMs have maps created that indicated ownership of parcels. Owner can voluntarily supply names to the RMs and ownership can be determined this way. Having to post contact info is no different than having to post land to prevent trespass - worse actually because now even the people who didn't care have to post.	The access may be an impediment to some degree but not an unreasonable one. The requirement for permission would lead to more responsible use of these lands. If the person using the land truly "for legitimates uses" does not abide by conditions set by the landowner they will not get permission again.
Yes	No distinction	Telephone, text or email	No
Yes	All agricultural land should be treated the same	The landowner should be approached and provide verbal or written permission	No
Leave this to land owners. Why should government decide how charges are dealt with on private property.	Yes	How ever land owner wants to deal with it.	Yes. Government has no right controlling what happens on private land. This is not a trespassing issue. Deal with the theft which is happening in rural areas. Stiffer penalties and quit releasing these criminals.
Yes	All the same		No.
Yes	yes	direct contact with landowner before further access to property	no
I think in any scenarios where the public is going to access rural private property, they should obtain consent. I do not believe that in all circumstances this failure to secure consent would constitute an offence. I think if someone merely walks onto land and leaves no trace and causes no disturbance (for example to take a picture or to catch a pet) that should not be an offence. Although in both scenarios consent could be obtained by those seeking access.	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same. However, many yards are used for an agricultural purpose, the concern is if someone drives into someone's yard without permission, are they committing an offence.	I feel like phone calls or accessing the residence is the best method to obtain consent.	I do not believe this is an unreasonable impediment. I believe obtaining consent would create a better system for landowners and would allow a system of respect to be in place for those who plan to use the property.
No, I do not support the proposed change, the rules should remain unchanged. The current regulations in-place are sufficient to protect landowners and property. .	Landowner must clearly express their access requirement as currently in placed.	For access to posted land Verbal permission is sufficient	Yes, the proposed change will make recreational activity in rural area impossible
Yes yard sites might be tricky tho	Treated the same	Verbal or text	Don't care

Yes	Yes	It may be a good idea to use municipal offices, but I also feel it could add to the municipal work load and also, what if people do not want others to know their contact info? More would need to be done in ways of protecting privacy. Perhaps emails could be added to a registry that could be accessed.	I think there needs to be balance here. Most people post if they do not want their land entered (for things such as snowmobiling).
yes the land belongs to me and unless I post it otherwise no one should be allowed to access.	all land treated the same.	by email or telephone call through municipal offices.	no it is not there land they should better plan their activities.
I agree to a point, but does that mean that people who seek directions because they are lost, or religious groups, who canvass door to door, would be breaking the law? That is too extreme. Maybe permission for hunting privileges would be adequate.	Yes, all should be treated the same	Personal contact or telephone	Not to properly planned ones - but yes to 'spur of the moment' activities
Yes	All land treated the same	Directly contacting land owner and obtaining written consent	No
Yes, there should be a requirement of consent for individuals to enter upon private land, regardless of activity.	Yes	It would be undesirable to have a residence approached seeking permission. The municipal office would be a better approach, providing email address or post address. A phone number could lead to nuisance phoning, so not desired	there should be a reasonable effort made with representatives of groups, such as a snowmobile or atv. Land owners who have networks on their property essentially are passively granting permission to access and possible signing waivers with clubs. The impact of deviating from these trail systems would potentially create problems.
Yes!!!!	All land should be treated the same.	If I want people to hunt. I'll put a sign up with my number	No.
No, access to rural land should be permitted for the purposes of hunting if the land is not posted.	Treated the same	Phone call or in-person visit	Consent for recreational activities should be considered before consent for hunting activities. As a landowner I would rather have a hunter walking on my land than an ATV ripping through it.
Yes	All land should be the same	The RM can facilitate by sending an email to landowner with the information of the person who is asking permission to access the land.. Landowner can then contact the person asking for permission Or phone # instead of email..	No it is not unreasonable.. it is dangerous to those who are not familiar with the land. trap lines, grain bags hiding in the snow.. old equipment or barb wire fences.. are all dangerous. Old well sites.. There are many hidden dangers..
Yes	No and yes	Directly from land owner by main road access	
Yes	No	Attending residence Contact list at RM office	No, the land owners can still be contacted and asked if they can access the land
Yes. Strongly agree.	All privately held lands should be treated the same including all agricultural lands that are cultivated or in a natural state.	All permissions should be sought by searching public contact information and should correspond through voice, email or social media means before entering the land in attempts in seeking someone for permission.	No. Communication has never been in history to be so easy and fast to contact individuals you may be seeking. If permission is denied it is not to be looked at as an impediment but for legitimate bio security or privacy reasons. Every individual has the opportunity to purchase and become land owner of land for their own use and enjoyment. If this is not feasible for some individuals there is public lands and parks for their use under rules regulations and laws governed by the province.
Yes. Urban land owners have the right to assure their property is protected by trespassing law, rural land owners should be afforded the same rights.	There should be no distinction, this is where the discrepancy currently lies in SK. By making trespassing illegal without permission on all types of land, it eliminates the grey area that is currently causing confusion on this matter.	Via private email address available at rm offices. This eliminates excessive need for people to attend private residences which is invasive.	The use of ATVs and other recreational vehicles is currently an issue on our land. It should be no impediment on those who follow the law. This is why there are clubs who maintain trails who could continue to seek permission on behalf of its members for the purpose of passing through a private property. All others should be responsible to assure they are riding on land where the landowner has given approval, otherwise this is trespassing.

<p>Yes all people wanting to come on private land should require permission farmers just because they own more land should not be any different than people in the city as a farmer I am more than happy to grant access if I asked ,but I'm fed up with people that I have found on my land that think that it is their right to be on my land which is private property without permission. It is time that people with more land be granted the same rights as people with less land that the same laws apply ,I would be in big trouble if I went to the city or to a private government or privately owned business and set up trail cameras and dug goose pits</p>	No not at all	The people that have asked me for permission in past have always approached me at my farm yard after getting a map out from the local Rm and finding out who the property or asking the administrator if the name is not the same or if the land is being rented who they should contact	To me it is real simple if I am responsible for what happens on my land regardless of who is on my land then anybody that is on my land should be asking for permission whether they are walking driving skidooring ect
Yes	Should be treated the same	Through municipalities and email or phone call	No
Yes	All land treated the same	Yes - more information to contact the land owners at the RM office would be helpful like emails addresses and cell phone numbers as well as landlines. RM maps indicate where the land owners live and people should be able to find anyone they need to seek permission. If there is going to be tougher legislation to prevent trespassing then its only fair that the efforts to get in touch with land owners is made easier.	Not at all. There are already people respectfully obtaining permission to access land for recreational activities. Taking the time to get permission from the land owner implies that they are respecting the owner of the land and will take care in what activities they are doing while on the land.
Yes	Same	If they are serious about getting permission to access the land they should have an rm map they try to contact land owner by figuring out names on quarters or drive to their yards	Yes it should be a requirement in all activities
In regard to First Nations, their Inherent Rights to their land, waters and way of life trumps any Provincial legislation and any individual desires of private land holders. The hunting and gathering activities that are essential to the well being of the Sovereign Indigenous Nations are not to be diminished or determined at the whim of settlers, who I add are obligated under Treaty, Canada's Constitution and the United Nations Rights of Indigenous Peoples to share all lands throughout the numbered Treaty's with the Indigenous Nations who are native to these lands. A land owners right to deni access should be limited to their home quarter in which they have an occupied dwelling. This being said, all lands outside the boundaries of the occupied home quarter that no longer have a standing crop or livestock present should be clearly marked with explicit instructions as to reasonable limits of access, such as Foot traffic only, bow hunting only, no vehicles and or warnings of any hazards present. Public land access and the Rights of Indigenous Nations require nuanced solutions that take into account the needs of all peoples, not just the economic desires of the privileged few. Under Treaty, settler Canadians have a duty to uphold the honour of the Crown, this requires rectifying the systemic dispossession of the Indigenous Nations we signed International Peace Treaties with, and who's Lands we are still occupying and hoarding. Perhaps tax insensitive for land owners who open their lands to the public should be implemented.	Not all land or industry is the same, and this requires us to implement nuanced solutions that recognize and are accountable to our Treaty responsibilities. Open up access but limit it to foot traffic only. Create tax incentives for those willing to maintain seasonal public access. Require that land owners clearly post any hazards or restrictions, and limit landowners ability to denie access to their home quarter to which they maintain an occupied home dwelling.	No permission should be required. Terms of access and restrictions should be clearly posted and violators penalties should be more severe.	Yes, and for numerous reasons. First being the realities of locating and contacting landowners, who now more often than not do not live on or near the land in their possession. Another reality almost always overlooked by settler society is the very real existence of racist prejudice and resentment toward First Nations by much of rural Saskatchewan's settler population. The Inherent Rights of Indigenous Nations and their Peoples are not to be determined by at the whim of settlers. Indigenous Rights are not up for debate and yet many of Saskatchewan's already existing laws and practices already violate our international Treaty obligations with First Nations, and still equate to ongoing cultural genocide. Settler privilege is not benign, reconciliation lies within dismantling the status quo, not bolstering it.
Yes	Should all be the same	Phone call or mail or farm visit	No ! too bad
yes	treat all land the same	I think that going to a person's residence, by the most direct route from a main access point (as indicated in this question), to seek permission sounds reasonable to me.	
Yes	Treat it all the same	They should have to find you and ask	No
Some exceptions should allow for entry. For example, if my vehicle breaks down in winter and i need to ask a landowner to borrow a phone to call a tow truck, there might then be implied permission for that very limited purpose.	All agricultural property should be treated the same subject to historical access and use of pathways	Reasonable efforts can include contacting RM offices for phone number of landowners	Consent prior to access is reasonable. Too much abuse occurs and there is too much of an attitude of entitlement by motorized recreation users. Landowners suffer. Even the noise of such vehicles is enough to cause owners to rightly reject permission to use their property.

Yes.	Treat all land the same.	I think that going to a person's residence to seek permission, by the most direct route from a main access point, as noted in the question, should be reasonable.	I don't think it would. I think that gaining consent for land that may have large numbers of people wanting to access it could be coordinated by recreational groups, i.e. snowmobilers could gain consent to access private land with snowmobiling trails on it by joining a snowmobiling group that had gained consent on behalf of its members.
	Yes	Written note on person from land owner	No
yes. if permission not given, it is an offence to be on that land or shoot into that land	treat the same and do not require a fence or natural boundary or enclosure as this is consistently mis- used by trespassors. private land is private land	in writing - by handwriting to the mailing address or email if that landowner provides approval to do Permission has to be sought from the landowner or person leasing that land. Protect privacy and do not provide phone numbers as that information may be misused.	This is not unreasonable. If they want to come on to the land, they will have to do the work to get permission.
I fully support changing Saskatchewan legislature to require members of the public to attain express permission prior to accessing private land. As a land owner in Saskatchewan, it is unfair to require landowners to pay for signs and take time off of work (often in the middle of harvest season) to post land that was bought and paid for by the land owner themselves. No urban dweller needs to post their own land in the city to keep people off, and rural landowners should receive the same rights. If I, and I alone, paid the \$100,000 for the land, why should someone else have the right to access my land without permission? Similarly, why would I, having spent \$100,000 on a quarter of land, also be required to buy signs and post my own land? In addition, requiring permission would likely, in the long term, create better hunting opportunities for larger trophies; the trophies that Saskatchewan was once known for and which have been sadly lacking across much of the province in recent years. Protecting land owner rights will also have the added benefit of creating opportunities for hunting of larger trophy animals. As a hunter, I am in full support of legislation that promotes hunter-landowner relations and results in potentially larger trophies. As a landowner, I am in support of legislation that protects my property rights, the same as any city-dweller. As a farmer, I am in support of the legislation change because I am tired of dealing with hunters driving through standing crops to shoot an animal, then claiming that they somehow missed seeing the 30+ signs on my land. As a biologist, I am in support of this change because it has the potential to have a significant positive effect on animal populations and trophy size. I understand that there will be backlash from some of the hunting community, however, I have discussed this very issue to great extent over the past years, and have been surprised by the overwhelming support from hunters and landowners alike. Furthermore, I would suggest that when backlash from hunters is received, that it be pointed out that this is not removing access to private land, simply requiring permission ahead of time. Those farmers who do not mind hunting will be happy to grant permission. Personally, I would far rather receive numerous calls each day asking for permission than deal with dead animals and ruined crops. Implementation could be as simple as requiring written permission. Frequently updated RM maps made available online with landowner contact information would help make the transition simpler for hunters seeking permission each hunting season. Thank you for your consideration, [REDACTED] Landowner & hunter	There should be no distinction between land types. Freshly seeded alfalfa looks like bare field when covered by snow, as do winter crops. Besides, the land is private. Does it matter whether a yard in the city is grass, gravel, or pavement? No; it is considered off-limits to the public without permission regardless. Rural landowners should have the same respect and rights.	By personal visitation with the landowner, or by phone. Most landowners re much happier to receive an influx of calls than they are to deal with the aftermath of trespassing or the hassle and expense of taking time off of harvest to post their already-privately-owned land. Regularly updated, free-to-access RM maps supplied online would be a great way to assist in this.	No it would not. Access could still be easily attained from the many landowners willing to grant it. This will simply hopefully reduce the frequency of trespassing and lighten the burden on landowners rather than requiring them to continually combat trespassing hunters, Quaders, and snowmobilers. Having lost livestock to such individuals in the past, this restriction is not unreasonable. Public land is still available if so desired. Again; is it unreasonable that I can't cut through someone's back yard to shorten my route to the bus stop when I am in the city? Absolutely not (and that's a matter of employment/education, not simply recreation).
Yes	Yes	Permission should be in writing at landowner residence. Phone contact first is preferable.	No
If there is a crop you don't want people tromping on the crop. But what if they snuck over the fence to take a closer look at the crop? Or took a strand or two of wheat for a souvenir? Should they be charged with a criminal offence? I don't think so. Or if they went to look at some nice grasslands, crossing the fence if there were no cattle in sight? I don't think so. But if someone is going in and tromping on the crop, throwing beer bottles around, or churning up the land with an ATV they should be charged. As well as anyone that opens a fence that is holding cattle and doesn't shut it properly. The ATV people who go off trail should be given a major penalty as well as those who don't shut the fences properly, Crown owned land is public land, even if it is leased to someone and people should be able to have reasonable access to it. How would someone ever know who owns a piece of land, unless it is posted on every corner?	A distinction should be about whether or not it is government land that is leased or privately owned land. Another distinction should be about the use - ATVs and drinking parties can cause a lot of damage. Birdwatchers and photographers would likely cause less damage. Another distinction should be about the type of cultivation. Certain crops would be crushed by people walking among them, fruit trees would not be, pasture land would be least affected by gentle walking. But people should be made aware not to carry weed seeds into the places they are walking.	We get scared driving onto someone's property to ask a question - what if they have a gun? Some system is needed so people can contact landowners.	Lots of people will hop over a fence to pick berries. Maybe the landowner was saving them to pick the next day and will be sad. Having a number to call would help. Then the landowner just says no. So where do people go to give their children that experience of being close to the land picking berries?
Yes	No	List kept at rm office of people that allow hunting etc	No
Yes	No distinction	If I want people bugging me for access. I'll post a sign to do so	No

No. This seems extreme. I would think more people that don't mind people on their land far outweighs those that do have issues with trespassing. Additionally this law would not affect criminal activities. The definition of criminal is just that, one who does not follow laws.	Yes	Via phone or email. But this has to be available through rm maps or some other means. I wouldn't want people coming and going out of my yard necessarily. But, through phone or email I have the option of giving my homestead location where we can talk face to face	In some cases this would be unreasonable. When it comes to hunting, hunters are flexible in their travels and cover many square miles. It may not be areas they initially intended to hunt, or had prior permission to hunt on. This can be an impediment if opportunity arises and they haven't yet acquired permission.
Yes	All treated the same	They should have to phone or within person get verbal or written consent	No it wouldn't
I think the current laws work, however I would change it for any vehicle. I believe expressed permission should be granted prior to driving a vehicle into a field. But that being said I don't think a snow mobile should be required to necessarily gain access to a vacant field in winter.	The presence of cattle should be treated differently, but otherwise the current laws appear to be working.	This becomes difficult when properties are owned by holding companies and other entities. It always helps when landowners post their contact info. But I've asked for permission on many unposed prices of lands and the land owner is always responsive. I think the current system of if it's posted ask works the best as then landowners that don't care about hunting can leave it unposted and don't have to deal with people seeking permission. While the people that care can put up signs.	It can really limit hunting opportunities and snow mobilers will be very limited as well. I have always gotten permission from landowners, but there are situations where you see animals on unposted land, which gives you an opportunity to hunt and since it is unposted you know the owner is not concerned. It it's posted you must gain permission.
YES !!	All land should be treated the same and require permission	RM maps are available to identify landowners. Telephone contact	No - it is not the landowners responsibility to provide access.
Yes..permission should be given for the safety of the landowner and those wanting access. I have been shot at ...had my fences cut...had cattle out on the road because of hunters not closing gates. I might add that NO HUNTING without PERMISSION signs are just torn off the posts. People do not respect the landowners .	All land should be respected and permission should be asked in all cases. Could I go and access someone's acreage or back yard without permission....I don't think so.	In a rural area..someone always knows someone. and if people are polite and respectful in seeking access..then landowners will help them find telephone numbers or land locations.	NO...Trails are provided for recreationalists... Hunters and the like can ask permission it is not that difficult...most landowners don't have a problem...If they say no it is for a reason and safety. Such as permission has already been given to a group of hunters....so not safe...or Crop is still out in the field...or excavation is taking place...trenches to fall into for example.
In all situations, where verbal consent has not been expressed by the land owner, to a member or members of the public, it be considered an offence. Consent must be sought out by members of the public.	All land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same.	When seeking permission from a land owner at their place of residence, an individual must take the commonly used/main route, road, driveway, approach, etc. If a land owner has the main route blocked off with a fence or gate, that is the extend of an individuals allowed travel. Landowners should be required to provide some form of information either though signage at the property or left with their RM office. Information would include but not be limited to email addresses, mail address or phone number.	Concent should be required for individuals such as atv-ers, hunter, campers, snowmobiles and other recreationalists. However, if a recreationalist is found on the property and states that the landowner gave them consent. They must present either written or verbal consent from the landowner within five business days, or the fine stays owing
Yes they should have to ask land owners for permission	All should be treated the same	written	If they want to ride the atv's so bad buy there own property.
Yes	If it is privately owned then all lands require express permission.	phone, email or verbal.	Yes it would but you have to respect it is privately owned and because it is rural not urban should not matter.
yes	no	contact land owner and get written permission	no
YES access to lands should be permission only posted or non posted. Only the landowner is aware of any potential dangerous areas, etc. And after all the landowner pays the taxes not the public.	NO, private land is private land. Permission only.	It isn't necessary for a landowner to provide an email or phone number. The landowner is not required to allow anyone access to his lands. The persons can obtain RM maps and use logical means to obtain permission.	NO There are opportunities for the public to access public lands for these activities. Everyone's definition of reasonable is different.

Yes	All should be treated the same except crown lease land.	Through phone, text or email. They will have to investigate to find land owners. It's not too difficult	No. They need to respect rural property in the same manner as they respect their own properties, lawns, trees, gardens. Recreational users often unknowingly damage roads, tree lines and personal property.
Yes,	all land being used for agricultural purposes should be treated the same	They should go to an RM office, which would have a record of telephone contact numbers, then written permission is required - this should be required for all peoples - First Nations hunting and fishing rights should pertain ONLY to crown land and reserves - on private land must be the same for all people	No
Yes	Should be treated the same	Through rm office	No
This is such a ridiculous thing, it's not even funny. If you don't want people on your land, post it! Otherwise you obviously don't care. Absolute waste of time!	Ya, it should all be the same. Post it if you don't want people on it!	Respectful people come to the door and ask if they can hunt on our land even though it's not posted. Disrespectful people will go on whether it's posted or not. As for skidoos, who cares?? What are they hurting??	
Yes. Agricultural land is generally used for food production. Access to food production areas must be strictly controlled by the producer to ensure the safety of the product being sold. Why should public access be granted to just anyone for any reason. If Saskatchewan doesn't get it together with respect to empowering its food production industry to protect the this industry from public contamination we will be left out...	The same. All food production. No access allowed. The risk of contamination is too great.	Permission by land owner.	No. Land open to recreation activities can be posted as such, otherwise it is off limits.
In grain land ..no one needs it be on a field used for food production ... food safety ..you don't even walk on a vegetable field in the southern USA .. you can't even take an orange across an international border .. it's not worth the risk .. yet you can hunt ,sled ,hike any where in sask .. club root big issue .. whose field did you drive in before you came to mine ? .. my agronomist can't drive in my field they walk	No even fenced. Pasture is still used . For food production ... .. let's contaminate the food system more ... .. if it's public property why is there tax on it .. ? ...	Land needs to be posted once through a land owner registry ... the owner name need not be on the r m map ... either hunting allowed .. no hunting .. or hunting on foot only .. as for driving or quading it's too risky to the food chain to permit ... you can contaminate my field with club root I want know for years I can't prove who brought it .. my income will be affected forever .. tax liability does not change .. forever as well .. all because of public access	No it's not ....but the liability to it is not worth the risk for the landowner .. ever been sued because a drunk snowmobile crashed into your cultivator buried in the snow ... if you give him permission your liable if you don't know he is there your not liable
Absolutely not. The current system has worked for over 100 years and the demands for change come from a vocal but small minority of land owners. The proposed changes will not deter criminals but will affect tens of thousands of innocent Saskatchewan residents. Saskatchewan farmers are quick to speak of how they are stewards of the land. To be a steward means to represent the interests of society as a whole; future generations both farming and nonfarming. It is not to secure a private fiefdom for self-serving individuals. To own land carries social responsibility in caring for it, managing wildlife and water passing through it. I understand the upset when irresponsible members of our society tread upon the rights of the landowner. The correct response of politicians however, is not to eliminate the rights of every responsible community member in all respects of land in Saskatchewan. To post land is not an onerous job. It happens all over the Province. Continue to make them express their will by requiring posting. To make it automatic is to allow landowners to automatically by default exclude larger society from innocent access. It is not necessary and serves no other purpose but the selfish interests of landowners. Societies interest as a whole should trump when the imposition on private rights is trifling.	There is no rational basis for any distinction between ag land.	I can tell you there will be those landowners who will specifically avoid any means of contact. They should have to post! The balance of convenience should fall to the public. It is easier for thousands of landowners to post than for hundreds of thousands of us to have to seek permission.	It is and would be an unreasonable impediment. There will be many who are occasional hunters and recreational activists who will simply discontinue their activities. To seek permission in an area distant from home for any reasonable interconnected distance for purposes of hunting on snowmobiling would be overwhelming for many. These activities will become the realm of the few zealots.
Yes. No trespassing!!! Private property. I pay the tax. Stay off!!	No. It's my land. Stay off!!	No one should be on my land. It's my land!	No. It's my property. Stay off
No	All the same.	Express or implied (ie not posted).	Yes. An unreasonable impediment.

It should not	same	It shouldn't. The balance of convenience should fall to the public. The current system of requiring landowners to post is not onerous and casts the initiative to the landowner. As stewards of the land, landowners owe the public for the right to own land. Land ownership comes with responsibilities. Politicians need to balance interests and not prefer one over the other where it is not necessary. The current system has worked for over 100 years. Leave it alone!	Yes. To arrange interconnected travel for hunting or atvng will be onerous and will simply knock many out of the activities. Only the diehards will even try.
No. The current system has existed for over 100 years and has served both public and landowners well. To change it will not deter criminals. To change it will encourage even further restriction of access to private land for legal purposes simply by default. The system of requiring posting requires landowners to address the issue of public access. By default many will deny it simply by saying no whereas they would not take the initiative to post. The onus should be on the owner. The right to own land comes with responsibility as well as rights. There is no crying need to change the law; only the selfish cry of a few would be kings!			
I believe land access is a privilege not a right. I would support amendments to the trespass laws within reason. Changes that are good for the landowner while still allowing recreational access to unoccupied agricultural land for hunting.	I believe there should be a distinction between fenced and open agricultural land. Perhaps a distinction between on-foot entry versus vehicle entry would simplify this matter, especially for hunters.	The ability to find and ask permission must be easy through some method. Phone, email, or homestead location. Or access sign-in area that allows permission.	It would be an impediment for hunting but not unreasonable. In Montana, they have private lands marked as Block Management Areas (BMA). Hunting on a BMA requires signing in each day of hunting. Hunting is on foot only. The landowners do not need to deal with each individual landowner if their land is included in the program.
Yes	Same	Information available through RM offices and permission needs to be asked prior to entering any land	Not a problem for rural residents as permission is always asked prior to activities but urban riders need to still ask permission.
Yes	All agricultural land should be treated the same	Access to landowners through municipal offices. Each landowner should be surveyed to grant permissions for what form of contact information they will allow to be shared.	As stated above, "there is no legal entitlement to access private property". Recreational activities may still be carried out in designated areas or with express consent of landowners. Therefore no, this would not represent an unreasonable impediment.
No	There should be a distinction between them	It should not be needed	Yes
Yes	It should all be treated the same	RMs should help with landowner access, via email address	No it would not, we have public snowmobile trails and ATVs can cause a lot of damage so permission should be requested before trespassing.
no	no	all owner/occupiercontrolled land be posted with a VALID PHONE NUMBER TO CALL for access permission	yes
No. As a new Saskatchewan Resident, the current system works great. Landowners like to get a call before you use their land, however, if you can't get a hold of them, you can still legally use their land.	All land being used for agricultural purposes be treated the same to avoid confusion.	An email or verbal permission via a phone call should be sufficient. If I was a landowner, I wouldn't want people knocking on my door constantly to get permission.	
No. I like the idea of right to roam. Walking across a pasture is unlikely to cause harm. But people who enter private property whether rural or urban with a weapon OR with any motorized vehicle, without prior permission, should be fined severely. ATVs and hunting gear can do massive damage to crops, pastures, animals and people.	Does entry mean on foot or by vehicle? My reply to the first question applies here. No reason except possible life-threatening emergency should allow anyone to drive onto private cropland or pastureland without prior permission.	Farmland - contact the occupant if there is anyone there. My sister-in-law, on a ranch miles from town, has had to face down armed hunters who drove right past her house to invade her pastureland. If not available, go to the RM office and find out who owns the land in question. Call them.	Anyone with an atv or snowmobile has invested a large amount in his own fun. He should be willing to invest an equal amount of effort to maintaining the environment he wants to use. Paying for areas to use his toy should be part of the cost. Merely having a machine that CAN go anywhere should not give you permission to tear up private or public land, destroying the enjoyment of others.
Yes	Treat all the same		No
Yes.	It should all be treated the same.		