FILED
APR 26 1983
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF JOAN CHRISTENSEN AND FRANCIS LEROY MAHAN

UPON THE PETITION OF)
JOAN CHRISTENSEN,)
Petitioner/Appellee/Cross-Appellant,)
AND CONCERNING)
FRANCIS LEROY MAHAN,)
Respondent/Appellant/Cross-Appellee.)

Filed April 26, 1983

3-44
2-68422

Appeal from Black Hawk District Court, Peter Van Metre, Judge.

Respondent-husband appeals and petitioner-wife cross-appeals from the decree dissolving the parties' marriage. AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED.

Stanford J. Patterson, Waterloo, for respondent-appellant.

David J. Dutton of Mosier, Thomas, Beatty, Dutton, Braun & Staack, Waterloo, for petitioner-appellee.

Considered en banc.

PER CURIAM

Respondent-husband appeals and petitioner-wife cross-appeals from the decree dissolving the parties' marriage. On appeal, respondent-husband asserts (1) that the child support and attorney fee awards are excessive; (2) that the trial court should not have ordered him to pay most of the parties' debts while awarding him only half of the parties' liquid assets; (3) that in dividing the parties' equity in their house, the trial court should have given respondent-husband credit for the debt he incurred for the down payment, and then equally divided the remaining equity; (4) that the trial court should have provided that respondent husband's lien for his share of the parties' equity in their house would earn the highest legal interest; and (5) that the trial court should have allowed him more vistitation with the parties' children. On cross-appeal, petitioner-wife asserts (1) that the child support and attorney fee awards are inadequate, and (2) that the trial court should not have required her to pay respondent-husband's lien for his share of the parties' equity in their house before the parties' children were grown. Petitioner-wife also requests attorney fees on appeal.

I. Scope of Review

Our review of dissolution proceedings is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. We review the facts as well as the law and, from the credible evidence, determine rights anew on those issues properly presented. In re Marriage of Horstmann, 263 N.W.2d 885, 888 (Iowa 1978). While we give weight to the trial court's findings of fact, especially with regard to credibility of witnesses, we are not bound by them. Iowa R. App. P. 14(f)(7).

II. Financial Provisions of the Decree

On de novo review, we find that the trial court committed no error in its division of the property of the parties, and that the court's rulings on child support are consistent with our cases and are not inequitable. Those provisions of the

court's decree are therefore affirmed.

III. Visitation

Francis Mahan contends that he is a responsible and caring parent, and that the trial court's limitation of his visits with the children to one weekend per month and alternating holidays with no provision for a visit during the summer vacation is not in the best interest of his children. Joan Christensen, on the other hand, argues that since she has a full-time teaching job, she should be entitled to enjoy the company of her children on weekends and during the summer months when she is able to relax and be free from the obligations of her employment.

Our review of the record reveals no substantial reason for the court's determination that Francis's opportunities to visit his children should be so limited. In the absence of strong evidence that the children's interests would be adversely affected by more frequent visitations with their father, a more liberal visitation schedule is clearly called for. We therefore modify the court's decree and order that Francis be permitted visitations with his children on alternating weekends and for one month each summer, in addition to those holidays spelled out in the court's decree.

IV. Attorneys Fees

Joan has requested that Francis be ordered to pay additional attorneys' fees and that he be ordered to pay attorneys' fees on appeal. Considering the parties' assets and ability to pay, we affirm the award ordered by the trial court and order each party to pay his or her own attorneys' fees on appeal.

AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED.