FILED
MAR 23 1988
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

JAMAAL JOHARI BEARD, by his mother and next friend,	)	
MARTINA MORROW and MARTINA MORROW,	)	Filed March 23, 1988
Petitioners-Appellees,	)	20
vs.	)	7-432 / 87-219
RALPH E. BEARD,	)	
Respondent-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County (No. CE 024-13736), George W. Bergeson, Judge.

Father appeals and mother cross-appeals the child support provisions of a paternity decree. **AFFIRMED.**

Richard D. Hermann of Dick Hermann Law Office for respondent-appellant.

Robert A. Hutcheson and Michael R. Blaser of Brown, Winick, Graves, Donnelly, Baskerville and Schoenebaum for petitioners-appellees.

Heard by Oxberger, C.J., and Hayden and Sackett, JJ.

OXBERGER, C.J.

The respondent Ralph Beard is appealing the child support provisions of a district court ruling in a paternity action. He asserts the support obligation is excessive. He also asserts he should not have been required to pay attorney fees and medical expenses. The petitioner Martina Morrow cross-appeals the ruling claiming the back child support obligation should be paid in a lump sum rather than installments, and that she should receive additional trial attorney fees. She also requests appellate attorney fees. We affirm.

Martina Morrow filed a paternity action under Iowa Code section 675.7 seeking to establish Ralph Beard as the father of her child, Jamaal. She also sought past and future child support. Beard admitted paternity.

The trial court ordered Beard to pay support in the amount of $80 per week, plus $10 per week until the past support arrearage of $5,065 was retired. The court required Beard to pay Jamaal's birth expenses that were not covered by Morrow's insurance. Beard was also ordered to pay a portion of Morrow's attorney fees.

The parties dispute our scope of review. This matter has just been resolved by the supreme court in Mason v. Hall, No. 86-129, slip. op. (Iowa Feb. 17, 1988). The scope of review in paternity cases under Chapter 675 is at law for paternity determinations; collateral matters such as support, custody, visitation, costs, and awards are reviewed de novo. Id. at 4. Thus, our review of the support provisions is de novo.

Beard claims the child support ordered by the court is excessive. He argues that Jamaal's needs are not $80 per week, that he has two other children to support and has only recently begun receiving child support payments from his ex-wife, and that the trial court should have followed the Polk County Child Support Guidelines.

The mother of a child born out of wedlock may recover from the father a reasonable share of the necessary support of the child. Iowa Code § 675 2 (1985). We consider applicable provisions of Iowa Code section 598.21 in making our determination. Moen v. McNamara, 272 N.W.2d 438, 442 (Iowa 1978). It is the duty of the court to consider other child-related obligations, including the cost of raising other children in the custody of the party, when setting amounts of child support. Id. at 441. We are not required to equalize the available income among the children involved. Id. at 443. Upon our de novo review we agree with the conclusions of the trial court in full.

The record reveals that Martina has a net income of $1,265 per month Her monthly expenses are $1,177. Ralph, on the other hand, has a net income of $2,300 per month. His monthly expenses total $1,599.

While we recognize that Ralph is supporting two other children, we do not have to equalize the available income. Moen, 272 N.W.2d at 442. Ralph's income is sufficient to provide for his children as well as Jamaal. The fact that his ex-wife is not making support payments is unfortunate, but Ralph has taken no steps to enforce the obligation. Jamaal should not suffer because of this.

Ralph also argues the support is not in accordance with the temporary child support guidelines. These rules are only for temporary child support pending final hearing. They are not intended to serve as a guide for permanent support We give them no consideration in this appeal.

Finally, Ralph contends he has a daughter that may require additional therapy expenses in the future. This expense is speculative and should not be considered in determining current support obligations. Cf. In re Marriage of Heinemann 309 N.W.2d 151, 152 (Iowa App. 1981).

Martina's cross-appeal concerns the payment of the past support awarded The trial court determined Ralph's past support obligation and deducted payments

Ralph had already made. The court then ordered Ralph to pay $10 per week until the arrearage was retired. Martina contends Ralph has approximately $53,000 in liquid assets and should pay the past support in a lump sum.

We see no reason to compel Ralph to pay this past support in a lump sum Ralph's liquid assets consist primarily of AMOCO securities. These securities and his net worth are subject to market fluctuations. These costs have been set aside for his children's education, his retirement, and emergencies. We conclude that under these facts, allowing repayment over a period of years is fair to both parties and will not detrimentally affect Jamaal.

Ralph has not argued in his brief that he should not be required to pay Jamaal's birth expenses. Accordingly, we affirm that aspect of the trial court's ruling.

We also see no reason to increase the amount of attorney fees awarded Martina at trial. The award of fees is within the discretion of the trial court Iowa Code § 675.25 (1985). We will not disturb this ruling absent an abuse of that discretion. The trial court awarded Martina $600 towards the $1,380 in trial expenses. Martina presents no evidence showing this amount to be unreasonable and we will not disturb it.

We also conclude Martina should recover attorney fees for this appeal In view of the parties' respective financial capabilities, we order Ralph to pay $850 of Martina's appellate fees. Costs are taxed to Ralph.

The judgment of the district court is affirmed.

AFFIRMED.