

## Re: Packet sniffing problems

**Source:** <http://www.derkeiler.com/Newsgroups/comp.security.misc/2004-03/0358.html>

---

**From:** Walter Roberson ([roberson\\_at\\_ibd.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca](mailto:roberson_at_ibd.nrc-cnrc.gc.ca))

**Date:** 03/29/04

Date: 28 Mar 2004 22:24:59 GMT

In article <40673303.697701ED@anta.net>, Thor Kottelin <[thor@anta.net](mailto:thor@anta.net)> wrote:  
:chris@nospam.com wrote:

:> The company has every right to monitor the  
:> use of their computers.

:Not in my jurisdiction (Finland). "Employer actions may not jeopardize the  
:secrecy of the employee's private, confidential messages when using  
:electronic mail or data networks." – Act on the Protection of Privacy in  
:Working Life, <URL:<http://www.finlex.fi/pdf/saadkaan/E0010477.PDF>>

It appears to me, Thor, that you have misinterpreted the Act.  
I refer you to the beginning of the section you quoted, section 9,  
which clearly establishes that the employer *may* monitor the use  
of the network and the use of email. The sentence you quoted means that  
the employer cannot look at the content of "private, confidential"  
messages -- but that doesn't prevent the company from monitoring matters  
such as which sites were visited for how long and when.

Without my checking further, it isn't even clear to me that the sentence  
you quoted protects employees when they send "private, confidential"  
messages that violate significant company policies such as sending  
racist or sexist remarks, or use the networks for illegal purposes,  
or send confidential data to competitors without authorization.

The sentence above what you quoted says,

Separate provisions apply to the employer's right to use technical  
monitoring and control the user of electronic mail and data networks.

Before blindly accepting the sentence you quoted, I would want to  
know exactly what those "special provisions" were.

--

Strange but true: there are entire WWW pages devoted to listing  
programs designed to obfuscate HTML.