

clearly what its taxation policies are; it should not blame the former Minister or the Federal Government. It should face up squarely—

The SPEAKER (the Hon. C. T. Edmunds)—The honourable member's time has expired.

Mrs HILL (Frankston)—I am very pleased to be able to stand here in this place as the new member for Frankston.

My margin of success was slight in numbers—76 to be exact—but the swing of 7.3 per cent in this supposedly safe Liberal seat shows the depth of feeling against the previous Government.

Frankston is a neglected area in many ways because it was considered safe. It is not perhaps what has happened in Frankston but what has not happened. We have a hole in the ground but no hospital extensions. Promises were being made concerning the hospital so far back that it has become a sick local joke. The joke is: "What hole in the ground has its own large boiler house?" The answer is: "The Frankston Hospital."

Recently a new almost completed day surgical ward was opened by the previous Premier but at a cost borne mainly by the local people. They not only paid for most of it but also designed it. Perhaps that is why it will be a success! But still we have the problem of insufficient beds available for our growing needs. The position is further aggravated by the fast-rising increase in the aged population of Frankston.

In the past five years the number of residents aged over 60 has increased by 2500; that is the proportion of aged in the population has risen by 2 per cent so that 12 per cent of the population of Frankston is aged over 60! This compares with an average increase of less than 1 per cent for the rest of Victoria. Some of this increase has occurred as a result of the building, by a church fraternity, of a resident-funded retirement village. Supposed to be able to be self-sufficient, it is only now starting to build its own 30-bed nursing home. Honourable members should bear in mind that this is a nursing home only and not a hospital, so that if any of the approximately 700 residents be-

come ill it is either the Frankston Community Hospital or the Alfred Hospital which must find the necessary beds. The local ambulance section which could do with extra staff and new vehicles also becomes involved at this time of stress.

The local council feels the impact of the aged in the community. In conjunction with the Housing Commission, flats have been built in four different locations in Frankston. Some of these flats have not been completed as yet. All of this involves an added burden to rate-payers in the way of finance, a burden which should have been shouldered more by the former State Government.

The next impact felt by the council is in having to provide the services of a special social worker for the aged. She endeavours—and does it most ably—to sort out housing problems, handyman services, meals on wheels, home help services and ways to keep active bodies and minds. In all of this she is limited by lack of finance, but how much cheaper and more satisfying than filling the nursing homes! The cost of nursing home beds average out at \$47 per person per day. I wonder how many members are aware of the fact that for a pensioner to get a pair of new glasses the waiting time for an appointment is 22 months, and then he or she must travel to the Royal Victorian Eye and Ear Hospital to keep the appointment.

I realize that many of the problems of the aged are the responsibility of the Federal Government, but we should not have the present Canberra control after the next election.

Transport is another matter that causes irate tempers in Frankston. For many years, like with the hospital, we of Frankston have been promised a new railway station and a third line to the city which would allow the running of an express train, thus halving the time of travel to the city. Not only the previous member but the one before that won elections on that promise. Coupled with the annoyance of the Beach Street railway crossing and the debacle of the proposed overpass, is it any wonder that people become disillusioned with Parliamentarians?

Unemployment figures are high in Frankston and with it come all the associated problems, such as vandalism, law breaking and, the most heart-breaking of all, despair. I speak not only of the young—and I have had three children who faced that uncertainty of the future—but also of those aged over 40. Those of that generation often feel degraded when they are unemployed, so being of that age group I can also relate to them.

Frankston has been fortunate in that the pilot study for the police community involvement group has been based there. This group is housed in a council building that was marked for demolition, and this makes the group's task more difficult.

While commending the past Government for supporting the setting up of the police community involvement group, I must condemn it for the state of the buildings in which these people are expected to work. But for their dedication and enthusiasm, the project would have failed and the youth of Frankston would have been the losers.

All is not gloom in Frankston. The electorate is compact and is completely within the municipality of Frankston, which makes my office readily accessible to all. Sporting facilities are good and varied. There is a strong Greek community, a Dutch community, and an Italian community. No doubt there could be others of whom I am unaware.

I am proud to have served on the Frankston council for the past two and a half years, and I am looking forward to serving the people of Frankston as their first Labor member of Parliament.

Mrs SIBREE (Kew)—It gives me great pleasure to speak during this Address-in-Reply debate and to support the amendment moved by the Opposition. It also gives me pleasure to wish Sir Brian and Lady Murray a very fruitful time in this State, and to congratulate, through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, the Speaker on his election to the chair in this House and wish him well in the responsibilities and obligations that go with that office.

May I also congratulate the two new members on the Opposition side, the honourable member for South Barwon and the honourable member for Narracan, on their fine maiden speeches. May I also congratulate the new Government members on their maiden speeches, although I trust their stay will not be for long.

I should also like to comment on past members who held the seats from which new members have now made their maiden speeches. May I pay my tribute to them, although it has not been traditional to do this. Many of them served in this Parliament for a number of years and a tribute should be paid openly and publicly to them for their contributions, not only to this State, but in their electorates. That may be noted by others.

The Governor's Speech was more glaring in its omissions than in its inclusions. It was a Speech that completely ignored a number of practical aspects, such as how the Government intends to put into train its programme for Victoria for the next three years. I would like to dwell on this point in my speech today. By those very glaring omissions it becomes apparent that the amendment the Opposition moved to the Address-in-Reply is extremely relevant to the deliberations here today.

The Government claims, and rightly so, that it has received a considerable mandate from the people of Victoria. The Labor Party, in its pre-election promises, its pre-election scramble for power, its pre-election pulling of the wool over many people's eyes, created an enormous expectation amongst the people of Victoria of what Governments are capable of doing. There has been an incredibly dangerous precedent created, in that the Government created an expectation without considering the responsibility of making such large promises, and without the reality of how those promises were going to be delivered. Hopefully, in the not too long term, the people of Victoria will understand that they have given their faith to a group of people who will be unable to deliver their promises, and it will be impossible to fulfil the promises that have been made.