Page 501, Table II, row 1 should read: 59% t_{2g}, 41% e_g, 49% t_{2g}, 51% e_g.

As regards the experimental results, the corrected spin density agrees better with them than the previous one, while the charge-density distribution appears too spherical, thus supporting the suggestion that a nonspherical potential which increases the overlap integrals of the e_g functions might be more suitable [see also P. D. De Cicco and A. Kitz, Phys. Rev. **162**, 486 (1967)].

In principle, the Fermi surface may also have been affected to some extent by the errors in B_2 but this has not yet been checked.

The authors are indebted to Dr. Hodges for pointing out the error in B_2.

Hysteresis in Superconducting Alloys—Temperature and Field Dependence of Dislocation Pinning in Niobium Alloys, W. A. FIETZ AND W. W. WEBB [Phys. Rev. **178**, 657 (1969)]. On p. 665, column 2, line 21, instead of $S=3\times10^{12}$ read $S=3\times10^{-12}$. In Eqs. (13), instead of $(B/H)/\kappa^2$ read $(B/H)^{1/2}/\kappa^2$, and instead of $(B/H_{c2})(1-B/H_{c2})/\kappa^3$ read $(B/H_{c2})^{1/2}(1-B/H_{c2})/\kappa^3$. These errors entered during transcription, and so do not affect any of the results or conclusions, which are based on the correct forms.

Effect of Low-Temperature Structural Transformation on V^{51} Knight Shifts and Electric Field Gradients in V_3Si, A. C. GOSSARD [Phys. Rev. **149**, 246 (1966)]. The relative changes in electric field gradient at V^{51} sites in V_3Si upon transformation, as calculated in the point-charge model and quoted in Table II, should read, "Calculated: $(q_a-q_0)/q_0=+0.0024$ and $(q_c-q_0)/q_0=-0.0048$." The relative changes in field gradient due to the point-charge contribution are then ~30 times smaller and of opposite sign from the observed changes. They thus remain relatively insignificant in the total observed changes. I wish to thank Professor T. J. Rowland for pointing out the incorrectly quoted values.