In a case of merger of corporations, the transferee was not a "successor" under 108.16 (d) where the transferring employer had not employed the required number of employees for the required period of time. Progressive Fine Art Co. v. Industrial Comm. 263; 1969 c. 276 s. 584 (1) (a).

The claim of the industrial commission for unemployment compensation payments due from a bank prior to the time it was closed and taken over by the banking commission constitute preferred claims in liquidation by the terms of 108.23, Stats. 1997. 27 Atty. Gen. 769.

The claim of the industrial commission for unemployment compensation payments due from a bank prior to the time it was closed and taken over by the banking commission constitute preferred claims in liquidation by the terms of 108.23, Stats. 1997. 27 Atty. Gen. 769.
power of an officer to arrest the driver and hold him to bail. 44 Atty. Gen. 339.

State traffic patrol officers have power to arrest without warrant for all misdemeanors violations of the vehicle code committed in their presence and for violations not committed in their presence, upon probable cause and under the conditions mentioned in 654.05 (1), Stats. 1855. 45 Atty. Gen. 269.

State patrol officers are entitled to charge the same fees for mileage, court appearances, service of papers and like services in state traffic patrol cases, as the sheriff would be entitled to for performing like service. Such fees should be deposited in the highway fund.


On the subject of assistance in handling violations of criminal laws, see 47 Atty. Gen. 209 and 36 Atty. Gen. 96.

The state traffic patrol may permit local law enforcement personnel to ride in state patrol squad cars for training purposes, providing the municipality requests that the officers participate in such training.

48 Atty. Gen. 159.

110.075 History: 1967 c. 267; Stats. 1967 s. 110.075; 1969 c. 560 s. 30 (3) (a).

110.08 History: 1965 c. 226; Stats. 1965 c. 110.06; 1967 c. 260 s. 36; 1967 c. 652. 672, 684; 1968 c. 399; 1963 s. 316; 1965 c. 332; 1969 c. 500 s. 30 (3) (g), (i).

110.20 History: 1965 c. 591; Stats. 1965 s. 110.20; 1969 c. 560 s. 30 (1) (g), (h), (i).

110.98 History: 1965 c. 232; 1965 c. 432 s. 6; Stats. 1965 s. 15.87; 1967 c. 291 s. 14; 1967 c. 327; Stats. 1967 s. 110.98; 1969 c. 154 s. 377; 1969 c. 300.

CHAPTER 111

Employment Relations.

111.01 History: 1939 c. 57; Stats. 1939 s. 111.01.

111.01 On exercise of police power see notes to sec. 1, art. I; and on trusts and monopolies see notes to various sections of ch. 133.

On exercise of police power see notes to sec. 1, art. I; and on trusts and monopolies see notes to various sections of ch. 133.

The legislature, in dealing with labor disputes in the employment peace act, 111.01 et seq., and other acts, has recognized a public interest in the relation between employer and employee; and the enactments do not destroy and are not calculated to invade contract rights, but seek to protect the public against unfair labor practices and to foster the continuance of that relation in which the public is interested; and the legislature deals with labor disputes, not primarily as a method of enforcing private rights, but to enforce the public right as well. Appleton Chair Corp. v. United Brotherhood, 258 W 387, 1 NW (2d) 188.

111.01 to 111.19 should be liberally construed to secure the objectives stated in the declaration of policy. "Chairman Ray-O-Vac" v. Wisconsin E. R. Board, 600 W 310, 44 NW (2d) 666. Select aspects of the Wisconsin employment peace act. Smith, 35 MLR 338.

The "compelling state interest" exception to the federal preemption doctrine. Dunphy, 46 MLR 29.


A study of the Wisconsin employment peace act; selection of collective bargaining representatives; union security. Hafer, 1956 WL 283 and 481.

111.05 History: 1939 c. 57; Stats. 1939 s. 111.05; 1945 c. 424; 1947 c. 526; 1955 c. 377; 1955 c. 263; 1965 c. 263.

Under the employment peace act, a mere finding of the employment relations board that employees picked the employer's plant without a majority vote by secret ballot to strike does not terminate their employee status for the purposes of the act, and such finding does not require the board to find or order that their employee status was thereby terminated for having committed an unfair labor practice, the act being construed to vest in the board a discretion to determine whether the conduct of an employee or employees shall result in a termination of the employee status.

Appleton Chair Corp. v. United Brotherhood, 229 W 337, 1 NW (2d) 188.

A nonprofit charitable hospital corporation, as an employer of nonprofessional employees, is subject to the employment peace act, ch. 111, regulating employment relations, so as to be subject to an order requiring it to bargain collectively with a labor union, such an employer not being within the named exceptions in the act, and the act not indicating an intent on the part of the legislature to exempt charitable institutions. Wisconsin E. R. Board v. Evangelical Deaconess Soc., 242 W 78, 7 NW (2d) 590.

A matter involving a resident employer and resident employees, under a claim that the employer had violated the state law in respect to unfair labor practices, was within the jurisdiction of the state employment relations board although the employer also had employees without the state. International B. of Electrical Workers v. Wisconsin E. R. Board, 246 W 352, 15 NW (2d) 255.

The term "craft," as used in 111.02 (6), Stats. 1945, was intended to comprehend any group of skilled workers whose functions have common characteristics distinguishing them sufficiently from others so as to give such group separate problems as to working conditions for which they might desire a separate bargaining agent. Ray-O-Vac v. Wisconsin E. R. Board, 249 W 112, 23 NW (2d) 488.

An employer and a union had the burden to establish their claim that a wrongfully discharged employee had obtained "regular and substantially equivalent employment elsewhere" and hence, was not an "employee" entitled to reinstatement with the former employer, and evidence showing only that the employe status was thereby terminated for having committed an unfair labor practice, the act being construed to vest in the board a discretion to determine whether the conduct of an employer or employees shall result in a termination of the employee status.

Appleton Chair Corp. v. United Brotherhood, 258 W 387, 1 NW (2d) 188.
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