

Australian National Library

Barrier Miner (Broken Hill, NSW : 1888 - 1954),

Monday 25 September 1922, page 4

CHARGES AGAINST HUSBAND

CRUELTY AND UNFAITHFULNESS

Allegations of cruelty towards his wife were made against Arthur George Williams in the Renmark Police Court on Wednesday (reports the "Advertiser"). Williams was charged under the Married Women's Protection Act with having failed to provide maintenance for his wife, Kathleen Williams, and her child, and with having been guilty of cruelty towards her on various dates.

Mr. E. F. Skewers who appeared for the complainant, said that the parties were married at Renmark in 1910, and almost from the outset marital difficulties arose. Williams went to the war in 1915, and returned in 1917, and for a time his conduct was satisfactory.

Later he became enamoured of other women, and actually brought two of them to the house, ostensibly to work, but whilst they were there Mrs. Williams was treated more like a servant than the mistress of the home.

He even went, so far as to refuse to allow his wife to speak at the table, and when she asked for money to buy clothes he told her to go on to the streets and earn it. Williams devoted most of his attentions to the other women, whom he took out driving and for walks round his property.

One day he struck his wife and she left him. He made over his military pension to her but gave her no other money. She was given a house by her brother to live in.

Late one night Williams arrived at the house in a drunken condition and demanded accommodation. Mrs. Williams refused the request, whereupon the defendant said he had a revolver in his pocket, and with that he threatened to blow her brains out. The complainant ran outside, and eventually the defendant left the place.

Evidence in support of counsel's statement was given by Mrs. Williams.

The defendant, who was not present, was represented by Mr. B. H Fleming, who produced a telegram from Williams, stating that he was in Adelaide undergoing medical treatment, and was unable to attend the hearing.

The court made an order granting Mrs. Williams a separation, giving her the custody of the child and ordering Williams to pay 20' a week in support of his wife and child.

Link to TROVE website

<http://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/45584628?searchTerm=Mr.%20E.%20F.%20Skewesj&searchLimits=>

National Library of Australia

Murray Pioneer and Australian River Record (Renmark, SA : 1913 - 1942),

Friday 24 November 1922, page 24

DOMESTIC UNHAPPYNESS.

The Williams Case Revived

The domestic relations of Arthur George Williams and his wife, Catherine Williams, were farther ventilated at the Renmark Local Court on Tuesday before Mr. L. H. Haslam, S.M., J. M. South and C. Pitt, when the husband sought to vary the order the court made against him last September in respect to the maintenance of his wife.

The information read. "An order made by the Court whereby Arthur George Williams was ordered to pay 20/- weekly in support of his wife and child (George Walter Williams), and it was further ordered that Catherine Williams (his wife), be relieved from obligation to cohabit with her husband and be entitled to have the custody of the child. Williams states that the order was made in his absence, he being unable to attend in consequence of total personal incapacity resulting through an accident, and therefore prays that further enquiry may be made as to circumstances of the whole matters and that the order be varied or discharged, and further prays that Catherine Williams be summoned to show cause why the order should not be altered or varied or discharged".

Mr. R. P. S. Von Bertouch appeared for the informant, and Mr. K. F. Skewes for Mrs. Williams.

A preliminary objection to the information by Mr. Skewes was overruled by the Court.

Arthur George Williams said he had been served with a summons to appear at the last hearing of the case. Before it had been heard he met with an accident with the result that he had had three ribs broken and a rupture. He was an inmate of Nurse Hill's private hospital in Adelaide and was operated on for the rupture by Dr. Burnell. In consequence of the operation he had been in bed for a fortnight.

He had returned from the war in April 1917 and lived with his wife in the town. Subsequently he secured a block of his own and worked it. He had two women on the block but it was incorrect to say that he had driven those women about and had left his wife at home. He had never told his wife that she would have to walk the streets and earn money if she wanted to buy clothes. She had been given his pension money. She had had no money from witness since July, 1922 but he had offered her money during that period. He saw her in July after her mother had died. They were not living together then, having separated in 1916. The cause of the separation was that they had disputes about money matters and witness was accused of having carried on with the two women he employed on his block one of the women was married and the other single. They had been paid wages.

The married woman had two children and they were also at the house. The married woman had known his wife from school days. The two women occupied one room and he and his wife occupied separate rooms. When the women first came to the house he and his wife had occupied the same room. The women left after witness and his wife had occupied separate rooms.

There was a row among all the women and they had a real "box on".

The result was that they all left and he was left in the home alone. His wife returned to him six weeks later at his request. They still continued to squabble over money matters. Subsequently she left him again and went to live with her mother. That was in 1918. He had asked her two or three times to return to him but she refused, saying she did not want the witness or any other man. He had offered her £15 in July, 1922 and she said she would not take it. She eventually accepted £5.

On September 8 he called at her house at 11.30 p.m. He may have had a drink but was not drunk. He asked if she could put him up for the night but she said she would not. He did not tell her he had two paid men with him nor did he threaten to blow her head off. She ran inside and closed the door.

She had received more money from him than she had told the court. He had not been able to work since his accident on September 14.

Court said that as the order standing was only for a small amount it was not proposed to vary or discharge it and it would remain.

Link to TROVE website

<http://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/109313683?searchTerm=DOMESTIC%20INiAFPBCSS&searchLimits=>

South Australia, Australia, Police Gazettes, 1862-1947

Name: Arthur George Williams
Age: 34
Birth Date: 1891
Year: 1925
Place: South Australia, Australia
Reference Description: AU5103-1925 SA Police Gazette 1925
Source Information:

Ancestry.com. South Australia, Australia, Police Gazettes, 1862-1947 [database on-line]. Provo, UT, USA: Ancestry.com Operations, Inc., 2016. This collection was indexed by Ancestry World Archives Project contributors.

Original Data:

South Australia Police Gazette Indexes, 1862-1947. Ridgehaven, South Australia: Gould Genealogy and History, 2009.

Description:

This collection of South Australia police gazettes spans the years 1862 to 1947.

A warrant has been issued at Adelaide for the arrest of ARTHUR GEORGE WILLIAMS, described as an Australian, laborer, 34 years of age, about 6ft. high, fair complexion, light-brown hair, clean shaven, grey eyes, good shaped nose; last heard of at Renmark about September, 1924; charged with failing to comply with an order made against him in respect of the maintenance of his wife and child. He is therefore to be arrested and brought before the Police Court, Adelaide, to be further dealt with according to law. Warrant filed at C.I. Branch, Adelaide.—(C.2084.)