FILED
FEB 22 1979
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF VIOLET FINKEN AND WALLACE G. FINKEN

Upon the Petition of)
VIOLET FINKEN,)
Petitioner-Appellant,) Filed February 22, 1979
And Concerning)
WALLACE G. FINKEN,) 25
3-61965
Respondent-Appellee.)

Appeal from Harrison District Court - Jerry L. Larson, Judge.

Petitioner wife appeals from economic and child custody provisions of the parties' dissolution decree. Affirmed.

Douglas S. Lash, of Porter, Heithoff, Pratt, Reilly & Lash, of Council Bluffs, counsel for appellant.

Gary Altwegg, of Murray, Altwegg & Anderson, of Logan, counsel for appellee.

Heard by Oxberger, C. J., Donielson, Snell, Carter and Johnson, JJ.

PER CURIAM

Petitioner Violet Finken appeals from the child custody and economic provisions of the dissolution of marriage decree. On appeal, Violet asserts that the long range best interests of four of the parties' minor children would be better served by awarding custody to her, and that the distribution of property and payment of child support ordered by the trial court is inequitable and unjustified.

At the time of dissolution, the Finkens had been married almost 30 years, and 5 of their 9 children were minors ranging in age from 17 to 6. Wallace operated a farm, and Violet worked intermittently as a registered nurse during the marriage. In its decree, the trial court awarded custody of the 5 minor children to Wallace, subject to reasonable visitation rights in Violet, and ordered Violet to pay $75 per child per month in support. As property settlement, the trial court awarded each party one of three separate farm tracts acquired during the marriage, and divided the third between them. Because the tracts separately awarded to Wallace had a higher value than those awarded to Violet, the trial court awarded Violet an additional $37,444 as property settlement, to be paid in equal installments over a 20 year period.

On appeal our review is **de novo.** Rule 4, Rules of Appellate Procedure. We give weight to the findings of the trial court, but are not bound by them. In matters of marital asset division we are guided by the criteria listed in Schantz v. Schantz, 162 N.W.2d 398 (Iowa 1968), without consideration to fault, In re Marriage of Williams, 199 N.W.2d 339 (Iowa 1972). In child custody matters, we are guided by the criteria listed in In re Marriage of Winter, 223 N.W.2d 165 (Iowa 1974).

Without reciting the difficulties this family has experienced, we conclude that the evidence preponderates in favor of Wallace on the issue of whether he or Violet would better satisfy the best interests of the children as custodial parent. The trial court was in a superior position to evaluate the character and demeanor of the parties, and we do not disturb the custody or support provisions of the decree.

Further, we conclude that the property settlement ordered by the trial court achieves an equitable division of the partes' assets, both as to value and method of distribution. This marriage lasted almost 30 years, and both parties contributed substantially to the acquisition of property. We do not disturb the economic provisions of the decree.

AFFIRMED.