 E R R A T A

SIGN OF THE CONDUCTION ELECTRON CONTRIBUTION TO THE ELECTRIC FIELD GRADIENT IN METALS. F. Borsa and R. G. Barnes [Phys. Rev. Letters 12, 281 (1964)].

We have used as the definition for the electric field gradient, $V_{zz} = eq$, where e is a unit charge carrying its own sign. In using Eq. (5), therefore, Ze is negative since it refers to electrons, and the values of $Ze q_F$ in Table II are of opposite sign. Thus, the conclusion is that for tin no agreement exists between the values of eq_{cond} derived from the Knight shift anisotropy and the one inferred from the experiments. As a consequence nothing can be said about the sign of eq_{cond} in In and Sc and in Table II the values of $eq_{\text{cond}} = eq_{\text{exp}} - eq_{\text{latt}}(1 - \gamma_\infty)$ for these metals could be -270×10^{12} and -195×10^{12} as reported as well as $+433 \times 10^{12}$ and $+75 \times 10^{12}$, respectively. We are most grateful to A. C. Gossard for pointing out to us this error.

SPIN RELAXATION IN SOLID ^3He : OBSERVATION OF EXCHANGE BOTTLENECK. B. T. Beal, R. P. Giffard, J. Hatton, M. G. Rich-

ards, and P. M. Richards [Phys. Rev. Letters 12, 393 (1964)].

The value of $\omega_L/2\pi$ at $20.0 \text{ cm}^3/\text{mole}$ should be 2.0 Mc/sec instead of 1.2 Mc/sec as quoted in Table I. We wish to thank Dr. R. L. Garwin and Dr. H. A. Reich for calling our attention to this misprint.

SELF-CONSISTENCY OF SUPERGLOBAL MULTIPLET ASSIGNMENTS. R. E. Cutkosky [Phys. Rev. Letters 12, 530 (1964)].

Through a production blunder, Table I was not printed with the original paper. It is given here.

Table I. Crossing matrix for meson-Sakaton scattering, multiplied by 8.

	(15)	($\bar{6}$)	(3)
(15)	3	5	15
($\bar{6}$)	2	6	-6
(3)	3	-3	-1