

# LESSONS FROM THE FOURTH TEST

THE British Isles deserved to win the fourth Test, and good luck to them. Again they played the football. Again we played or tried to play, the dull, got-to-win, unimaginative, leave-it-to-the-forwards, over-the-top-and-the-best-of-luck game that apparently is now characteristic of New Zealand Rugby. I think it's about time the New Zealand Rugby Union instructed the selectors on the type of game they expect, or the public expects, should be played, and instructed them to select the players accordingly. Not that I have any grouse about the players. But I have a definite grouse about the tactics they're told to use. It must have been obvious to the New Zealand captain five minutes after half-time that the instructions the team had been given were out of character. But it wasn't till about five minutes remained for play, when New Zealand were really down the drain, that he and his colleagues decided that instructions or not they wanted to be in the game as well as the British Isles. Alas for them, it was too late—far too late.

I feel very strongly about this. We used the forward tactics against the Springboks in 1956 because it was necessary for our prestige to win after seven successive Test defeats from South Africa. Last year against the Australians, with two new selectors out of three, we used the same tactics and many of the same players when we should have been scouring the country for new players to try out against the British Isles in preparation for South Africa next year. Why do we play this game of Rugby—for New Zealand, for the players, or for the selectors?

I'm very thankful that I saw the fourth Test. I saw Jackson's try. Risman's, O'Reilly's—one that should never have happened really. I saw eight New Zealand forwards playing against odds that should never have been odds. For instance, fancy putting into a lock position one of the most accomplished flankers we've had in years—Colin Meads. It's not fair to him, to the other 14 players, to New Zealand. The upshot was that Conway, New Zealand's best for many years in the foraging department, was forced to go into the rucks to try to hold the British forwards. What a tragedy the fourth Test was for New Zealand. Another thing I'll never forget was 60,000-odd people cheering the British Isles every time they tried to do something—a great tribute to the British Isles and, I think, to the sportsmanship of the New Zealand public. How seldom did they have a chance to cheer New Zealand.

We had Don Clarke at full-back—a man who has been pilloried throughout the country for his full-back play. Where is there a better full-back in New Zealand? Certainly on a greasy ground he couldn't get to those very subtle kicks of Risman. He had to turn around to chase them. That's why they were kicked that way, on a greasy ground where a heavy man finds it hard to turn. But tell me anything Don Clarke did wrong. When you come to think of it, he scored 39 points for New Zealand in these four Tests. Such a thing has never happened before. There's nothing wrong with Don Clarke. He's the best that New Zealand has had for many a day.

We had Caulton and McPhail on the wings. I feel very sorry for McPhail. He was brought in in the first Test at a moment's notice when Diack was injured, the only untried player. What did

they do? They left him for dead all day and because he misjudged a kick into touch from which the Lions scored he was left out of the other Tests. They brought him in again this time when McMullen couldn't play. What sort of show did he have? None, from the word go. He had to stand up against Jackson throughout the piece, the only chance he had all day was to tackle, and then half the time he had nothing to back him up. What about Caulton? After two tries in each of his Tests he was never given a chance and never had a chance to look for anything himself. Once he went down the line and looked as if he might get somewhere, but that was that.

In Terry Lineen we've got, I suppose, the best bet in the New Zealand back-line these days—second five-eighth. In two Tests he was allowed to run, but neither McMullen nor Brown could take his passes. So the selectors decided to play him at centre three-quarter, and he had one chance all day. Towards the end he did everything to try to get the ball to make some play, but he had no show of getting it. Then we had Adrian Clarke, a boy who played one game against the Australians last year. Aucklanders have told us for so long what a wonderful first five-eighth he is. So he's brought in as a second five-eighth for the fourth Test. He had only one chance, which he made for himself in the first spell, and made a beautiful run out towards the right wing, right down.

It's a toss-up whether Urbahn or Briscoe, the two best scrum-halves in New Zealand at the moment, should play for New Zealand. When Urbahn is put in as half-back you have a feeling immediately about the type of game the New Zealand selectors want to play. So it was in the fourth Test. I've nothing against Roger Urbahn. Like everybody else in New Zealand these days, he's given instructions, and unless he carries them out he won't be in another team. He did everything asked of him. When he had to play to his forwards he did that short one over the top. If we wanted to play the backs we would have had Briscoe in the team. I'm not saying anything against either Urbahn or Briscoe, but the type of game New Zealand is going to play is related to the half-back selected. Take young McCullough, who plays with either half-back. He can attack as well as any man in the country, at first five-eighth. He can get away, he can let the ball out very quickly. When he plays with Urbahn he plays the Taranaki game. I felt sorry for McCullough. Because Urbahn dare not let the ball out, and when he did try to open up the play the New Zealanders found that the British Isles had two very accomplished flankers in Murphy and Morgan—who was looking after Urbahn, not McCullough. I'll have a word about that later.

I've mentioned Conway. I felt sorry for him, a man who could win games for you, as he did so decisively at Wellington and Christchurch, forced to come back into the forwards and not allowed to employ the type of game that he favours—destroying the other boys and starting his own team in attack. That was because we didn't have a core in our forwards. MacEwan was out, ill. Tiny Hill was the key to our forward play, but one man can't stem the tide. And so they bring in Colin Meads. Bad luck for him, but he's not forgotten, he'll go to South Africa—a very accomplished player. On the side of the scrum Tremain played a lovely game, but what

could he do? He too had to go in and try to hold the British Isles team. And don't forget New Zealand won the third Test in the forwards—therefore the British Isles couldn't win the fourth one in the forwards.

I was very pleased, too, with Rex Pickering. They brought him in to Number 4 in the lineout, and he went up and four times in a row was high above everybody else and took the ball. Once he burst right through. Then for some reason the New Zealand team changed their tactics. I couldn't understand. They're wanting to play a forward game, yet from the right wing position the ball was being thrown right

WINSTON MCCARTHY will conclude this series of exclusive reports in our next issue when he will make a final summing up of the Lions' tour.

towards Number 7 in the lineout. We saw Whineray stand in at Number 2 and the moment his wing three-quarter was starting to throw the ball in he quite obviously ran from Number 2 towards Number 7, apparently to start something off. Never did anything come from it, yet we persisted in it. In the front row we had Mark Irwin. I have no complaints about him. He will play in South Africa and I hope, the way he is going, he'll play for us for a long time to come. And then Hemi, of course—he's still the best hooker in the world and the best man on the front of the lineout.

There was a lot of talk beforehand that on the greasy ground the British Isles would be in trouble, but these men are used to playing on worse grounds than we ever see in New Zealand. Terry Davies showed us why he was chosen as the best full-back in the four Home Countries. The only thing I could complain about was his goal-kicking. He has kicked many goals. But I thought with the ball just a trifle greasy and on a greasy ground, where your run up is affected just a slight bit as you get to the ball, that where he stood only about a yard and a half from the ball for a kick 45 yards long he would have done better to go back another five yards. His direction was true, but his distance was faulty. However, he still played a lovely game, and his lineout kicking with either foot was as tremendous as I have seen from anybody except van der Schyff, the South African of 1949, and Don Clarke.

Tony O'Reilly is one of those people that sometimes you don't know whether he's a good footballer or not, and just when you think he isn't you know he is. Fancy him scoring a try on the blind side—only a short blind side, too—just between Andy Mulligan and himself. The ball was so quickly heeled that Mulligan slipped around and young McPhail had to come in and have a go at him—if he hadn't Mulligan would have scored. And of course O'Reilly grabbed the ball as it was passed to him from Mulligan, and he dotted it in the corner. You've got to hand it to O'Reilly—he scores the tries. Seventeen, you know, on this tour, which beat Ken Jones's record, and Ken Jones was perhaps one of the greatest wing three-quarters we ever saw.

We come to the delightful Jackson. I remember saying in my summary after the first game of the tour: You must see this Jackson. Afterwards some of the British Isles party told me: We have two better wing three-quarters than

Jackson. I'm sure they don't say it now. Jackson's fourth Test try was incredible. I know this was a pre-arranged try. You see, the British Isles players say that we have a different conception of flank forward and Number 8 play from theirs, and they felt that with our open side flanker rushing straight towards their fly-half there was a gap that the scrum-half could get through. Now when the scrum-half—Mulligan, in this case—puts the ball in, he puts it in on his left-hand side, and the New Zealand half-back—this time Urbahn—quite naturally stands right up alongside him and follows him around the scrum as the ball comes out. Well, as the ball came out Mulligan moved to the right and our flanker moved out towards Risman, who was the fly-half. That gave O'Reilly the chance to come in to first five-eighth after Mulligan had run to the right on the open side. Mulligan gave it to O'Reilly with a gap, and he moved right up to the centre of the field and threw his one-handed pass over the New Zealand defenders' heads. It was from there that Jackson got it, on the second transfer, about 10 yards outside the 25, and he did his incredible run, beating one man and then two others, and actually sidestepping a tackle right on the corner to score a try. It shows you that the British Isles had thought this game out, and it should give us a wee bit of food for thought.

Hewitt was rather subdued all day. In fact, I thought the British backs were a bit unhappy for quite a long time—that is when New Zealand got on top for about 10 minutes at one stage. But it was the ubiquitous Scotland who got them out of quite a lot of trouble with his left and his right foot kicks. And there was Risman. You know, his father played both Rugby and League, and I have a feeling that if Bev Risman decided to go to Rugby League in the next couple of years he would be paid the biggest price ever paid for a Rugby League player. If ever I have seen an old head on young shoulders on a football field, I see it on Risman.

Actually it was Risman's game and Don Clarke's—but Risman came out on top. I must describe his try again for you—I love to think of it. Outside the 25, about 20 yards from the left-hand touch as he looked down towards the goal-posts, the ball came out to Mulligan. And Mulligan actually moved to the right, with O'Reilly racing across to the right also. Then Risman, coming from fly-half, moved towards the left, and Mulligan gave him the scissors pass. Risman moved up to the 25 and sidestepped a player, and I thought he was going inside. But he came outside to the left. Of course on a greasy ground once you're moving the other players have got to turn and they lose momentum, and he went ahead and scored his try. I'll never forget that one. He's a wonderful player.

Andy Mulligan never played a better game than he did at half-back in the Test, I'm sure. When he ran from the scrum he ran properly. But everything they did suggested to me that it had been pre-arranged, that they had thought it out. The time will come when we will do it. And they had signals. In other words, they worked it out on the field, where New Zealand, in my opinion, work it out on the sideline.

There's a thing I must say about Dawson. When Don Clarke was talking his final kick at goal—the one that could have made it 9-all—Clarke moved to outside the 25-yard mark, about 10

(continued on page 23)