

South Perth said, but also has the ability to pursue specific cases. This will not be the last of such cases; other situations will inevitably arise. In doing his or her job, the commissioner must have the confidence of the community and he or she must be able to pursue the most tragic and extreme situations, because they will almost certainly point to greater problems in the system. Yesterday, members of Parliament and the community were confronted with the news that a teenage boy who was sent to piano lessons on a weekly basis over a six-month period was, according to the police, sexually abused on a weekly basis. As Hon Barbara Scott commented in the media: how worthless and abused must that little boy feel? He is our responsibility - of all of us in the chamber. However, the minister is the one person who is in a position to adjourn this debate and reinstitute the consideration in detail stage to correct the bill. I call on her to do so.

MS S.M. McHALE (Kenwick - Minister for Community Development) [12.18 pm]: I thank members of the opposition for their contributions over the past few weeks and, indeed, for their support of the legislation, particularly the members for Darling Range and Churchlands, who were the main contributors to the debate.

This is a major piece of legislation and I am pleased to have introduced it. During the second reading debate, I gave a commitment to reconsider a number of issues. A number of members raised the issue of penalties. I referred to the Sentencing Act as the act that explains and deals with penalties. In particular, I referred members to sections 9(2) and 42. As I explained during the debate, the Sentencing Act deals with the question of penalties when there are maximum penalties and when the option exists for the sentencing judge to hand down one penalty or both penalties.

We had a good debate during the consideration in detail stage. I made a commitment to reconsider issues that go to the heart of the commissioner's independence. The majority of the debate focused on the perception of independence. I as the minister and we as the government desire to deliver an independent commissioner. Therefore, during our discussions I committed to reconsidering the reporting requirements to Parliament, the reporting requirements of the commissioner and the relationship between the commissioner and the minister. I also committed to reconsidering the member for Churchlands' suggestion about ministerial reporting to Parliament. I have committed to working on other areas of concern with members in the upper house in a bipartisan way. It is important to send the legislation to the upper house on the basis that I have made the commitment that the government will work with the opposition and the Greens (WA) on the issues of independence. I do not want to prolong the debate. It is important that this bill reach the upper house to allow discussions to occur in the next couple of weeks.

Mr C.J. Barnett: What about individual investigations?

Ms S.M. McHALE: That is one of the areas I will work towards.

Mr C.J. Barnett: You don't work towards it; you fix it.

Ms S.M. McHALE: I listened in silence to the member for Cottesloe, and I have taken on board his comments and have made a commitment to reconsider those elements of the legislation. Whether the commissioner investigates individual complaints or provides advocacy is a matter that will be discussed further in the upper house. The matters that came to light yesterday were shameful. As minister, that is not the sort of behaviour I expect. However, it is the example of the sort of case a commissioner will investigate. He or she will investigate the systemic issues that arise from a case like that.

I thank the staff who have been involved in drafting the legislation - John Lightowlers, Jill Toohey, Tara Gupta - the children and organisations who contributed to the model, and the members of this house who support this legislation.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Council.

PARENTAL SUPPORT AND RESPONSIBILITY BILL 2005

Second Reading

Resumed from 1 June.

MR A.J. SIMPSON (Serpentine-Jarrahdale) [12.21 pm]: I am very happy to be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. As a father of two girls, I have found parenting to be challenging. Anything that assists parents to raise their children is a good thing. I am going through that process now with my children, who are aged seven and 11. I had to stop and think about their ages, but I should not have to. It is an interesting time. As parents, we try to raise our children in the best way we can. Sometimes we wonder whether we are doing the right thing. Certain things in life always make us very happy; for example, when we receive feedback that our children have been well behaved when they were out. We often say, "You must be talking about the wrong children; they can't be my children." Nonetheless, that feedback is an indication that we have done something right.

One of the most rewarding things I have done in the past 12 months with my daughters was to take them on holiday to Bali in April. One night we saw a mother and her two children outside our hotel begging. I encouraged my then six-year-old daughter to give her some money each night that we passed them. My daughter started a conversation with one of the children. It was interesting to watch her reactions. That experience is now useful in our home life. The minute I have trouble persuading her to do a simple task, rather than talk about the starving kids overseas I remind her

of the kid on the street in Bali. It makes her stop and think, which indicates the impact her experience in Bali had on her as a six-year-old.

We all go through the same stages with our children. It does not matter how much skin my eldest daughter loses, she does not seem to learn from it. At certain stages we have to put conditions on their behaviour. I am reminded of the television show *Super Nanny*, which I do not think is particularly good. However, the crux of that show is the need to set boundaries. The children on that show are taught that if they push the envelope, they will be put back in their place. Raising children is difficult. Any book that contained all the answers to raising children would be a very thick book indeed. This bill goes some way towards assisting parents with raising their children.

I have some concerns with a few issues that I hope can be clarified during the consideration in detail stage. However, all in all, the Liberal Party supports the bill. I have discussed my minor concerns with my party colleagues and they will support the bill. We would be foolish not to support something that will help parents raise their children, because being a parent is a very important role. I look forward to the bill being debated in the consideration in detail stage.

MR T.K. WALDRON (Wagin - Deputy Leader of the National Party) [12.24 pm]: The member for Serpentine-Jarrahdale is a father of two girls and I am a father of four girls.

Mr D.A. Templeman: There must be something in the water!

Mr T.K. WALDRON: Yes. That is why I am bald and broke but happy. The member for Serpentine-Jarrahdale made some good points. The Nationals and I particularly will always support legislation aimed at benefiting children. It is interesting that we are discussing this bill immediately after consideration of the Commissioner for Children and Young People Bill. Whatever matter we deal with in this house, particularly when it affects children, especially those who are under great pressure through circumstances over which they have no control, we must treat it seriously and give it our full consideration. The Nationals support this bill, albeit we have some areas of concern, which I will run through.

The premise of this bill is the encouragement and support of parents, in certain situations, in voluntarily taking greater responsibility for their children's behaviour. The Nationals support the premise of encouraging and assisting people to be better parents. We agree with the sentiment that parents must take responsibility for their children's actions. In many cases, we would like that to happen much more often. Parenting is a very difficult task. No-one gets taught how to be a parent. Probably 99 per cent of parents do the very best they can. There is not one correct way of parenting. Those who struggle with parenting need to be assisted as much as possible.

The Nationals have serious reservations about the imposition of orders. I also have issues about resourcing the orders and programs in country Western Australia. The imposition of an order is a last resort measure and is provided in this bill probably to give integrity to the process. Based on what was said during the briefings, the orders provision has been included to encourage people to comply. I also note that this bill must be considered in the context of other legislation that could be used when a child's welfare is in question. In effect, this legislation will give parents the opportunity to do the right thing before the worst-case scenario emerges. I consider that the worst-case scenario for children is their being taken from their parents. That is obviously done with the best of intentions and the safety and care of the children in mind. However, if that scenario can be prevented, that is a huge achievement. No matter what the state might want to do or who we may be, parents are the best people to raise their children. I acknowledge that, in the best interests of the children, we have to accept that that is not the case on some occasions.

Although the objects of this bill are based on good intentions, arguably it might not be well received by some of the people to whom it will apply - people who feel that the government has no right to impose such orders on parents. That is why I said that the premise of the bill is the encouragement and support of parents. When we discuss this legislation we must keep that in mind, and how the orders will be applied. We must emphasise the need to encourage, support and assist rather than the need to wield a stick. I would like to think that the penalties in this legislation are there to motivate parents. I will cover that issue more in a minute.

One of the big challenges will be to enforce the parental responsibility orders. Another challenge will be to fully resource agencies to ensure that the necessary support is provided. It will be interesting to see whether the government of the day is prepared to impose a penalty of \$2 000 on parents who do not comply with the legislation or to seize some of their property or impose a work order if they do not pay the fine. That will be a challenge, particularly in some communities in which a lot of these problems exist. This legislation could run into problems in that area. The Nationals take a very cautious view of the orders, particularly when action must be taken due to non-compliance of an order. In a perfect world that would not be necessary. The objective of this legislation should be to educate parents so that its provisions are not used. The National's fear that if parents who do not adhere to an order are punished, that will exacerbate an inflamed situation. Once again, member for Girrawheen, I suggest that it must be closely monitored. In fact, the legislation should be reviewed in 12 months.

Ms M.M. Quirk: It is in the legislation.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I should have known that, but I was not sure. Is it after one year?

Mr A.J. Simpson: Five years.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: I think we should review it after a year.

Ms M.M. Quirk: It is one year.

Mr T.K. WALDRON: That is good. I agree with that. As I said at the start, we must always try to help children. By helping parents who are having difficulties, we can help the children. That is why I will support the legislation. The alternative is that some children will end up in a life of crime; hence, that is passed on to their kids. Even worse is kids being taken away from their parents. I have been a member of Parliament for five years, and in that role I have dealt with this issue in my region. It is a sad situation when it reaches that stage.

The Nationals' preference would always be for greater emphasis to be placed on support programs to help parents and children before responsible parenting agreements or responsible parenting orders were needed. Another key issue for the Nationals, in particular, is the question of resources that will be made available to enable families who live in country areas to comply with responsible parenting agreements or responsible parenting orders. We will keep a close watch on the situation and go back to the government if any issues arise. Will the requirements be different for families who live in rural communities, given that the services are limited? It would be nice to know what additional resources will be made available in rural areas to support parents in meeting the requirements of the orders.

The Nationals support the premise of encouraging and assisting parents to be better parents. This may not work in all cases, and that is the concern, because then we move to enforcement. My wife is a schoolteacher. I see a lot of schoolteachers doing terrific work with children of families who are having a lot of difficulties. I have seen first-hand how this can work with Aboriginal people and non-Aboriginal people. I believe that the value of teachers to our community is sometimes greatly underestimated. Some teachers, off their own bat and through their schools, work with parents of children to help them become better parents. I know that my wife had regular meetings with one family. They went through some of the issues, and she made sure that the family was working on the same things at home. My wife even met with them at their home etc. Maybe one could say that is taking it a bit too far. However, at the end of the day, if people are passionate about something, they can get results. I know that in a lot of cases - not in all cases - results came from that, and it helped the situation for those children. If this legislation can work along those lines, there will be great benefits.

However, I will emphasise again the reservations I have. I am concerned about the imposition of orders, and specifically the repercussions of action to be taken if a parent does not comply with an order. Under this legislation, I understand that if people do not comply with an order, they can undertake the courses or the training again. However, the crunch will come, and that concerns me. Of course, there are also the resourcing issues for country families.

The Nationals' preference has always been, and will always be, for greater emphasis to be placed on support programs to help parents so that they can help their children before the orders and agreements are needed. I hope the member for Girrawheen takes my comments on board. The Nationals support the bill.

MR R.F. JOHNSON (Hillarys) [12.33 pm]: I will make a limited contribution [to the second reading stage of this debate. Similar to the member for Wagin, I have four kids. I would love to have upped the ante and had five or six, but I am afraid I could not quite make it.

Mr D.A. Templeman: Prolific breeders!

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Absolutely. The member knows that a good Pom cannot be held down - or maybe I was down too much!

I am very fortunate at this stage of my life because my four kids are all past the age of 18. At that stage, I thought I could say, "Guys, you're on your own now. You've got to be responsible for yourselves." I believe that is what should happen.

Mr A.J. Simpson interjected.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Absolutely. During the first 18 years of each of their lives, I had to do the job of a responsible father in trying to ensure that they learnt right from wrong, that they behaved in an acceptable way and that they went to school and received the best education they could possibly receive. I also made sure that they learnt the normal things in life that are very often missing these days; that is, being polite, being courteous and being respectful. I said "respectful". That is probably one of the most important things to instil into a child. If we can teach children to be respectful, a lot of the other things will come into play.

Unfortunately, many parents in our society do not take their responsibilities seriously. They allow their children under the age of 18, 16, 14, and even under the age of 10 or 12, to go out at night-time without any parental oversight. These children get up to mischief. Allowing children to do that is one of the most irresponsible things that any parent can do. None of my kids was allowed out past about 11 o'clock at night until they were 18 years of age. It crept up from about 10 o'clock to 10.30 pm and then 11.00 pm until they were 18. After that, of course, they could do what they pleased in many respects, but I knew that they had received some good groundwork in their upbringing. There are too many parents in our society - not the majority, I am very pleased to say - who do not take their responsibilities seriously. They tend to put their own pleasure before the responsibilities that they have for their children. By allowing those very

young children out at night so that they can get up to mischief and very often break the law, I believe the parents are costing this state not only in financial terms but also in the overall context in that a number of children will grow into adults without that basic training. It is a great shame that we have that situation.

The contents of this bill will address a lot of that - I hope it will. However, I will take this opportunity to say that this may well be a bill that the government has brought into this house because things have got worse over the past four years. I believe it was irresponsible of this government, within about a year of its coming into office, to close down the family information centres that were located in very busy shopping centres. They were accessed by many parents who had had problems either between themselves - husband and wife - or with their children, which was often the case. That was a fantastic service that was put in place by the previous government in 1996 or 1997, I think, when Hon Cheryl Edwardes was the Minister for Family and Children's Services. It was a great program. It cost money, but I believe money was saved through the fact that many people accessed those information centres, where they were counselled and received all the information that was required to assist them in the job of bringing up their children, thereby ensuring that a lot of these problems did not proliferate. People also accessed those centres when there were problems between the husband and wife. In other words, those centres assisted the whole family. It was a terribly irresponsible action by this government to close all those centres simply to save some dollars. We are paying the price now to some extent for that ill-conceived idea that the government had. I take this opportunity to remind the government of that, and the member for Girrawheen, because she had one of those centres in her electorate.

Ms M.M. Quirk: There was one in Mirrabooka, in the member for Yokine's electorate.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: I thought the member had one in her electorate also.

Dr S.C. Thomas: There was one in Bunbury.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Yes, there was one in Bunbury. The coalition government ensured that those centres were located in not only the metropolitan area but also the rural and regional areas. They were a vital part of trying to keep families together in a cohesive and loving way. That is a very important aspect of family life, because if kids are not given love, care and attention, unfortunately we will end up with young adults who are nothing but problems to themselves and to the wider community.

I have not studied the bill in detail because it is not my area of responsibility and I have been investigating other things which has kept me very busy; for example, tracking down paedophiles the parliamentary secretary has let loose either in this state or interstate.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Not me personally.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The government is responsible, but the parliamentary secretary, as part of the government, has to take some of that responsibility.

Part 2 of the bill refers to objects and principles. I notice that one of the principles is that the best interests of the child is paramount. I remember that principle was included in the child welfare legislation that the parliamentary secretary's colleague brought into this house two or three years after the Labor party gained government. It would have been about 2003. That bill was a long time coming, but that principle was the paramount criteria for that bill. I am pleased it is in this bill, because the best interests of the child must be paramount at all times if parents are not carrying out their duty. It is very easy to have a child. Ten minutes of pleasure can produce a child - half an hour in my case. It does not take much to have a baby; only a consenting man and woman. However, that action has ramifications for the child for the rest of his or her life. A couple must take responsibility for their actions. Children do not ask to be born into the world. They are born because of their parents and it is those parents who are responsible for the child. Parents should take their responsibilities seriously from the day the child is born, through the baby, toddler, pre-teenager and teenager stages. Most young people go through the dreadful teen stage. My two girls were worse than my two boys at that age, but I do not know whether that had something to do with hormones. However, after young people have gone through that period and reach 17 or 18 they become human again. There are many children who, unfortunately, experience various sorts of rebellion and insecurity. Kids need security and stability. If a child is given security, stability and love, he or she will be a great kid and a great adult. If a child misses out in any one of those areas, he or she will be a problem young adult and possibly a problem adult and his or her chances will be hampered.

I am concerned with responsible parenting orders under part 5 of the bill. Clause 12(1) reads -

An application for a responsible parenting order may be made by the CEO (Community Development), . . .

That is a bit of a worry because the Department for Community Development has not done very well with our kids in the last few years. Members are aware of the recent events.

Will they have enough staff to undertake this role? We are told that the department does not have enough staff to look after the wards of the state, let alone the children who are not wards of the state and who are in family situations where there are all sorts of problems. I question whether it has the ability to do that. I do not know whether the Department for Community Development, the Department of Education and Training or the Department of Justice will assist the

parliamentary secretary with this bill. They are the three departments that can apply for a responsible parenting order. Will there be an officer from each department at the table of the house when we go into consideration in detail?

Ms M.M. Quirk: No. The lead agency is the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: That is a worry. For goodness sake, we have one department that has nothing to do with applications for responsible parenting orders, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and in which there are so many spin doctors and very little substance. I will let the parliamentary secretary finish her interjection. What she said came as such a shock I had to interrupt her.

Ms M.M. Quirk: Thank you very much. Once the bill is passed and enacted, consideration will be given to moving it into an operational department, which will most likely be DCD, but that has not been decided.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: What section of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is actually responsible for this bill?

Ms M.M. Quirk: The Office of Crime Prevention.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We have a Department of Justice, a Police Department and a Department for Community Development -

Ms M.M. Quirk: We can discuss this matter in consideration in detail. I know the member for Capel will take part in this stage. I am happy to canvass that with you in consideration in detail or by way of interjection.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: We will deal with it in the consideration in detail stage. What the parliamentary secretary said gives me cause for great concern.

Ms M.M. Quirk: At your age you should not worry so much.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Normally one gets wiser as one gets older and I like to think that has happened in my case. I am a lot wiser and more tolerant than I was 20 years ago.

My initial thought is that it is another spin job from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and when something is implemented the Premier, not the parliamentary secretary, will cut the ribbon if it is a good news story. I am concerned there is a lot of spin and very little substance in this instance.

Ms M.M. Quirk: We should have all of cabinet there because it is a whole-of-government response.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The Minister for Water Resources and the Minister for Agriculture have an interest in this bill? How can it be a whole-of-government approach? It is a nonsensical comment. I think the parliamentary secretary will wish she had not said that, because that is not the case. It is the Department of the Premier and Cabinet doing a big spin job. Notwithstanding that some of this is important, I question why that department will deal with this bill; it should be the Office for Children and Youth or DCD. We know it does not have the funds to implement this bill -

Ms M.M. Quirk: The member may recall there was public consultation on this and a discussion paper was issued. At that stage it was principally a policy issue rather than an operations issue. When the legislation is passed, we will be moving into the operations stage.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: Is that one of the policy departments within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet?

Ms M.M. Quirk: The Office of Crime Prevention has within it the experts on early intervention.

Mr R.F. JOHNSON: The parliamentary secretary will have to prove that in consideration in detail because I have grave concerns about that.

I am concerned that the government does not have the troops on the ground to properly and efficiently implement what is in this bill. It is not doing that at the moment. There are so many kids swimming through the net that the ones causing problems are not being caught. If there is no cooperation from parents, it makes the job harder. If there are not enough officers in DCD to look after the wards of the state to make sure they are not being molested and are being placed in good foster family environments, how the hell will the government do this? It will be interesting. I wish the government every success. I would love to see those children who fall into this category have a better chance. I do not mind more government money going into this area, because it is more important than some of the matters on which the government is wasting money, and I include advertising in that comment. The government should use some of that money to put more troops on the ground to implement better child protection in this area.

I put on the record the points of concern to me. It will be interesting in consideration in detail to see how responsible parenting orders will be implemented and the sort of outcome that will be required to ensure that the funds expended in this area make a difference.

I will take a very active part in consideration in detail to ensure that the bill is properly scrutinised so that it achieves the best possible outcome that this state deserves.

Debate interrupted, pursuant to standing orders.

[Continued on page 5037.]

ROAD AND RAIL FUNDING

Statement by Member for Mandurah

MR D.A. TEMPLEMAN (Mandurah) [12.50 pm]: It is time that the federal government started to give Western Australia its fair share of road and rail funding. The federal member for Canning, Don Randall, is not standing up to his liberal colleagues in Canberra and demanding a fair share of federal road funds for the people of Mandurah and the Peel region. Instead, he is playing political games. The Perth-Bunbury highway, involving the extension of the freeway and the construction of the Peel deviation, is of critical importance to Mandurah and the region. Revised costings have shown that the project will cost \$110 million more than earlier costings. This increase is mirrored in other projects in the eastern states, including the Albury-Wodonga bypass and the Geelong bypass. When the federal Liberal government was asked to contribute more funds to these eastern states projects, it happily obliged. When the Western Australian government asked for extra funding to contribute to its half share, the federal government refused. This is outrageous and underlines the federal government's lack of commitment to Mandurah, the Peel region and the state. The Liberal member for Canning does nothing; he does not stand up for the west at all. It is time that the federal member for Canning stopped using the Perth-Bunbury highway as a political football and demanded that the federal government fund its half of the project. The state government will commence construction of this project in November 2006. I call on the federal Liberal government to treat us fairly, like the other states, and to ensure that we get more than our seven per cent of federal road funding and more than just the pitiful one per cent of rail funding that the federal government contributes. It is about time that the federal government gave WA a fair share and it is about time that members opposite stood up for the people of Mandurah.

SETH HOLDER, BATTEN DISEASE

Statement by Member for Murray

MR M.J. COWPER (Murray) [12.51 pm]: Four-year-old Seth Holder is the eldest son of Jocelyn and Stuart Holder of Seascapes, Mandurah. Until approximately seven weeks ago theirs was an ordinary family. Seth was taken to Perth for testing due to an apparent problem, which manifested in the form of seizures. After tests, Seth was diagnosed with Batten disease. Over time, affected children suffer mental impairment, worsening seizures and progressive loss of sight and motor skills. Children become totally disabled and eventually die. Batten disease is not contagious nor, at this time, preventable. To date it has always been fatal. The problem with this disease is that it is genetic, and the second child of Stuart and Jocelyn Holder, a two-year-old girl named McKenzie, was tested recently and has also been diagnosed with Batten disease. Stuart Holder has been actively trying to find a treatment for his son. It has been revealed that there is a new treatment available at the Cornell University Institute for Genetic Medicine in New York state. There are a number of prerequisites for this treatment to work. Seth has been tested and is currently at the Cornell University. Yesterday, Seth was given the all-clear for treatment. The Holder family is currently living in a one-bedroom apartment in New York awaiting further treatment for Seth. The local community has rallied to support this family in its time of need and has begun to raise funds to assist the Holders with airfares and accommodation, estimated to cost in the region of \$30 000. So far, in excess of \$10 000 has been raised and in a few weeks' time, on 9 October 2005, a fundraising event will be held at the Ulysses Motor Cycle Club, which will see a contingent leave from Perth. A sausage sizzle on the foreshore at Mandurah will be the culmination of the day. The devastating news of this disease to the Holder family is a timely reminder for all in this chamber of the importance of loved ones. I am sure members share my view and offer our collective best wishes to the family.

“SWAN VALLEY TEMPTATIONS”

Statement by Member for Swan Hills

MS J.A. RADISICH (Swan Hills) [12.53 pm]: It is always a pleasure to stand in this house and bring good news. Today I have risen to tell members of the success of a business in the Swan Hills electorate. Many members will have seen the quality home magazines *Instyle Custom Homes* and *Instyle Interiors*. These professionally produced and finely finished publications show a stunning variety of possibilities in the home building and decor sectors. Soon to join the stable is *Swan Valley Temptations*, Instyle's newest brainchild, which will be a showcase for the many businesses and activities that one can experience in the Swan Valley. It will provide a huge boost to tourism and will provide visitors with much useful information in an attractive format. It will make their visits to the Swan Valley more enjoyable and will adorn their coffee tables. The Premier and I had the honour of writing forewords to the first issue, which will be on the stands soon.

But back to the good news: Instyle has just been named “Best Home-based Business” at the prestigious Swan Business Awards held by the Swan Chamber of Commerce and the City of Swan. This is on the back of its award at the same forum last year of “Best New Business”. Michael and Alison Clarke from Swan Hills have brought the Instyle concept from a glimmer of an idea to a full-blown publishing company in only a few years, by sheer hard work, dedication and a belief in what they were doing. They have teamed up with Duncan and Kristy Middlemass to create *Swan Valley Temptations*, which will be launched later this month in time for Spring in the Valley. I urge all people to pick up a copy of *Swan Valley Temptations* at their nearest newsagent; or, better yet, to take a fact-finding mission to the Swan Valley, visit a winery or three and pick up a copy. They will not regret it.