FILED
MAY 22 1984
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF VIRGINIA L. PERRIN AND WARREN F. PERRIN 153

Upon the Petition of	)	
VIRGINIA L. PERRIN,	)	
Petitioner-Appellee,	)	Filed May 22, 1984
And Concerning	)	
WARREN F. PERRIN,	)	4-130 2-69633
Respondent-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Linn County - Thomas M. Horan, Judge.

Respondent husband appeals from the economic provisions of the parties' dissolution decree. AFFIRMED.

Charles R. Turner, Des Moines, for respondent-appellant.

James W. Affeldt and Cynthia Hanna Camp of Eels, Blackstock, Affeldt & Harms, Cedar Rapids, for petitioner-appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., and Donielson and Hayden, JJ.

Respondent husband appeals from the economic provisions of the parties' dissolution decree. He claims the child support and property division provisions of the decree are inequitable and that he should not be required to pay any of petitioner wife's attorney fees. We affirm.

Virginia and Warren Perrin were married in 1975. They have a son, Warren, Jr., born in 1975, and a daughter, Stacey, born in 1980. Virginia is a waitress and earns $400-500 per month. Warren is a toy glider airplane salesman; he earned $1,500 per month until he lost his job in January 1982. He testified at trial that he expects to either continue in the glider sales business or find comparable employment.

The trial court gave custody of Stacey to Virginia and custody of Warren, Jr. to Warren. It directed Warren to pay Virginia child support of $40 per week and to provide health insurance for both children. The court awarded Virginia her personal effects and Stacey's, the household goods in her possession, the washer and dryer in Warren's possession, and the bank accounts in her name. The other household goods were awarded to Warren. The court also awarded him the parties' house, subject to the mortgage and subject to a $5,000 lien in Virginia's favor. The court directed Warren to pay the parties' debts, court costs, and $1,000 toward Virginia's attorney fees. No alimony was awarded. Warren has appealed.

Warren's primary complaint is that the economic provisions of the decree as a whole are inequitable, specifically with regard to the property division and child support. In considering the fairness of such provisions, we view them as an integrated whole. In re Marriage of Castle, 312 N.W.2d 147, 149 (Iowa Ct. App. 1981). We examine the facts of this case in light of the factors listed in Iowa Code §§ 598.21(1) (property division) and 598.21(4) (child support).

We find no reason to disturb the provisions of this decree. The child support obligation is relatively modest ($40 per week). Although Warren was unemployed

at the time of trial, he testified as to various job possibilities open to him which would enable him to maintain the support payments. He also testified as to his willingness to maintain health insurance for Stacey if Virginia would not do so. Nor are we inclined to interfere with the trial court's distribution of property and debts. The court's objective in this regard, which we find to be equitable, was an approximately equal division, we cannot say the court's result did not meet this objective Finally, we accept the court's finding that Warren should pay $1,000 of Virginia's attorney fees In re Marriage of Williams, 303 N W.2d 160, 167 (Iowa 1981)

We therefore affirm the provisions of the parties' dissolution decree. Each party shall pay his or her own attorney fees incurred in this appeal.

AFFIRMED