

University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform

Volume 2

1968

Michigan Landlord-Tenant Law: Course of Statutory Reform

Prospectus

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjlr>



Part of the [Housing Law Commons](#), and the [State and Local Government Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Prospectus, *Michigan Landlord-Tenant Law: Course of Statutory Reform*, 2 U. MICH. J. L. REFORM 225 (1968).

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjlr/vol2/iss1/8>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

MICHIGAN LANDLORD — TENANT LAW: COURSE OF STATUTORY REFORM

DRAFTSMAN: FORMULATION OF POLICY

Carl Schier

PERSUADER: MOBILIZATION OF SUPPORT

Mary Ann Beattie

TENANT'S ATTORNEY: EVALUATION OF IMPACT

Ronald D. Glotta

This series of articles reflects Prospectus' continuing search for new formats that will highlight either the need for or the realization of law reform. In July 1968 the Michigan Legislature enacted a package of five bills that substantially altered the relationship between landlord and tenant. The new law became effective on October 1; hence it is too early to determine whether the reform will have a dramatic and beneficial effect. Some have hailed the legislation as the most progressive of its kind. Yet others like Ronald Glotta, a Detroit lawyer who actively participated in the successful rent strikes in Muskegon, Michigan in 1967, feel that the legislation is grossly inadequate to meet the task at hand and that it may hinder the collective efforts of tenants to better their living conditions.

This case history is not only an analysis of a significant statutory reform but also a case study of the legislative process. Regardless of one's evaluation of the likely value of the reform, it is interesting to ask (1) how Michigan was able to pass such legislation in a year in which the United States Congress was quite unreceptive to social welfare legislation and (2) how such reform might fare in other state legislatures.

The authors of these articles were influential figures in the "course of statutory reform." It is a tribute to their dedication that they can find time not only to aid the realization of change but also to contribute to an understanding of their roles, approaches and views so that others can benefit from their added experience.

