AUG 31 1978
CLERK SUPREME COURT

412

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF JEAN D. WORTHINGTON AND CARROLL J. WORTHINGTON

Upon the Petition of)
JEAN D. WORTHINGTON,)
Appellee,) Filed August 31, 1978
And Concerning) 576
CARROLL J. WORTHINGTON,) 2-60602
Appellant.)

Appeal from Marion District Court - M.C. Herrick, Judge.

Respondent husband appeals the alimony award contained in decree dissolving 34 year marriage. - Affirmed.

Mike Wilson and Ronald A. Baybayan, Des Moines, for Appellant.

Tom Hyland, of Hyland, Layden & Pearson, Des Moines, for Appellee.

Submitted to Donielson, Acting C.J., and Snell, Oxberger and Carter, JJ.

PER CURIAM

Respondent Carroll J. Worthington appeals the award of alimony contained in the decree terminating his 34 year marriage to Jean D. Worthington. Affirmed.

After the original decree was entered, the trial court upon Jean's motion to reconsider, increased the provision of alimony from $100 to $200 per month. Jean demonstrated her earnings from her less than a year's employment as a secretary provided approximately $514 of her needs of $809 per month. The trial court found that Carroll's earning capacity with the truck and trailer rig was far greater than the $400 per month that he testified to in court. The record at trial showed net profits before taxes from the operation of the truck alone in 1974 and 1975 to be $23,034 and $20,434 respectively. The trial court properly considered in deciding the alimony question whether the party ordered to pay may have demonstrated considerably more income-producing capacity than he purports to be realizing from his current activities. In re Marriage of McFarland, 239 N.W.2d 175, 179 (Iowa 1976). Carroll never filed a financial statement to apprise the court of his monthly expenses. He testified at trial he paid approximately $100 per month toward food and household expenses in the home where he was living. He paid temporary support of $300 per month to Jean during the pendency of the dissolution action. The trial court was convinced Jean was acting to reduce her expenses and to adjust to her new status. We find no error in the fashion in which Jean's needs were balanced against Carroll's ability to pay. The husband's inability to maintain the wife in the mode of living they enjoyed during the marriage ". . . does not negate his duty to contribute so far as is reasonably possible, to her support and maintenance." In re Marriage of Murray, 213 N.W.2d 657, 660 (Iowa 1973).

Costs are assessed against Carroll.

AFFIRMED.