

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Assistance Bill Consultation](#)
Subject: A Case for Encryption
Date: Thursday, 6 September 2018 1:15:03 AM

Hello,

As stated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, privacy is indeed a basic right. Should we disallow encryption, the only success it will bring is in demolishing this right and worsening quality of life in Australia.

Make no mistake, encryption is not a shield which protects terrorists or criminals in general from justice. Encryption is **the** driving force behind protecting basic human confidentiality in the digital age. If one wants to have a private conversation (like one should also be allowed to in person) they should be able. It seems as though what the proposed bill really wants to do is eliminate private conversation in general -- after all, 90% of criminals communicate privately -- but nobody would make a suggestion like that I would hope.

Consider the given example on the Assistance and Access Bill website (<https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about/consultations/assistance-and-access-bill-2018>); if the criminal in question was communicating in person, would law enforcement be left scratching their heads? Surely not. Why not gather information from the proposed victims? I truly do not understand this "predicament" when compared to communicating in person.

Yes, the internet is allowing us to communicate with an infinitely greater audience than ever before, but is a larger audience really the root of all our law enforcement problems?

Regards,

[REDACTED]