FILED
AUG - 9 1979
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF MARGARET ANN MCCLISH AND WILBURT DAVID MCCLISH

Upon the Petition of)
MARGARET ANN McCLISH,) Filed August 9, 1979
Petitioner-Appellee,)
And Concerning) 196
WILBURT DAVID McCLISH,) 2-62667
Respondent-Appellant.)

Appeal from Polk District Court - Robert O. Frederick, Judge.

Husband appeals economic provisions of dissolution decree. - Affirmed.

Davis, Baker & Bergman, Des Moines, for Appellant.

Margaret Ann McClish, Ankeny, Pro Se.

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

PER CURIAM

Respondent Wilburt David McClish appeals the property and support provisions of trial court's decree dissolving his marriage to petititoner Margaret McClish. We affirm.

Wilburt and Margaret were married in 1966 and have two children from this marriage. Margaret has custody of two children from a previous marriage and Wilburt has one child from a previous marriage for whom he pays $90 a month child support. Wilburt currently earns about $196 weekly take-home pay and Margaret earns $145 net weekly.

The trial court decree awarded Margaret custody of the couple's two children, divided their assets and ordered Wilburt to pay $35 per child per week in support, particular debts of the couple including one of $543 for dental work provided Margaret's daughter from her previous marriage and $500 for Margaret's attorney fees and costs. On appeal, Wilburt seeks reduction of the monthly child support amount and relief from liability for certain debts.

Our review is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. We find Wilburt's position in this matter as that discussed in In re Marriage of Florke, 270 N.W.2d 643 at 645 (Iowa 1978):

> Petitioner argues that the support burdens imposed upon him by the decree create an unreasonable hardship. His predicament, however, is not unique. Often in marriage dissolutions, incomes that were adequate to support married couples and their children are stretched precariously thin in order to cover the expenses of maintaining two households. Such is the condition presented by this case.

While the trial court order may stretch Wilburt's income precariously thin, we do not find it unjust or inequitable. The child support order of $35 per child per week is justified and the allocation of the indebtedness is equitable. Wilburt's liability for dental services provided Margaret's daughter is fair since the dental work took place during the marriage while Wilburt stood in loco parentis. In re Marriage of Carney, 206 N.W.2d 107, 113 (Iowa 1973); Simpkins v. Simpkins, 256 Iowa 989, 129 N.W.2d 723 (1964). Furthermore, the trial court did not abuse its considerable discretion in allowing and determining the attorney fee awarded Margaret. Locke v. Locke, 263 N.W.2d 694, 696 (Iowa 1978).

Costs on appeal are taxed to Wilburt.

AFFIRMED.