

University of Missouri Bulletin Law Series

Volume 1 *November 1913*

Article 4

1913

Masthead

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/lr>



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Masthead, 1 Bulletin Law Series. (1913)

Available at: <https://scholarship.law.missouri.edu/lr/vol1/iss1/4>

This Masthead is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of Missouri Bulletin Law Series by an authorized editor of University of Missouri School of Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact bassettcw@missouri.edu.

LAW SERIES

OF THE

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI BULLETIN.

Published Four Times a Year by the University of Missouri School of Law.

CHARLES K. BURDICK

Editor-in-Charge.

Board of Student Editors.

WENDELL BERRY.

ARNOLD JUST.

CURTIS BURNAM ROLLINS, JR.

GEORGE C. WILLSON, JR.

MYRON WITTERS.

KEEHN BERRY.

NOVEMBER, NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN.

NOTES ON RECENT MISSOURI CASES.

RIGHT OF COMMENT ON TESTIMONY OF DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE.—At common law the accused in a criminal case was incompetent to testify in his own behalf.¹ Statutory conferment of competency in the United States began in 1864, and in only one state, Georgia, does the common law disqualification now remain in effect.² In Missouri it was removed by the statute of 1877.³ That statute provided that "no person shall be incompetent to testify in criminal cases by reason of being the person on trial or examination." Such a statute does not violate the constitutional provision against compulsory self-incrimination, since the tender of testimony is always voluntary and constitutes a waiver of exemption.⁴ And since the statute contained no limitation on the right of the state to cross-examine a defendant who took the stand, it was held that he might be treated as any other witness and fully questioned concerning

1. Bishop's New Crim. Pro., § 1181.

2. Wigmore on Evidence, § 488; and § 579 where the statutes are collected and compared.

3. Laws 1877, p. 356.

4. Bishop's New Crim. Pro., § 1183.