$\leq M_{p\pi^-,0} < 1.32$ GeV, where t is the square of the momentum transfer between the beam pion and the outgoing di-pion system.

[10]Previous measurements (Refs. 1–3) of this branching ratio gave the values 0.23 ± 0.07, 0.08 ± 0.05, and 0.10 ± 0.05, where the first value (Ref. 1) was obtained from an assumed cascade decay $A_2 \to B_1(1040)\pi \to \omega\pi\pi$ and where $B_1(1040)$ is a new enhancement reported in Ref. 1. The weighted average of these three branching ratios is 0.11 ± 0.03. With our measurement the new weighted average is 0.14 ± 0.03.

[11]An A_3 interpretation is disfavored since the reactions considered in this report are charge exchange, whereas the A_3 is usually seen in non–charge-exchange reactions. Furthermore, we see no $A_3 \to f\pi$ in Reaction (2). To check for an $I = 1$ interpretation for the 1.65-

GeV $\omega\pi\pi$ state, we have looked for a $\rho^0\omega$ contribution by examining the ρ^0 signal as a function of $M_{\omega\pi\pi}$ (not shown). We find a smoothly varying $\rho^0\omega$ signal across the 1.65-GeV region consistent with no $\rho^0\omega$ contribution.

[12]J. A. J. Matthews, J. D. Prentice, T. S. Yoon, J. T. Carroll, M. W. Firebaugh, and W. D. Walker, Phys. Rev. D **3**, 2561 (1971).

[13]The mass and width of the $B(1235)$ were fixed at 1.237 and 0.118 GeV. T. A. Lasinki *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys., Suppl. **45**, S1 (1973).

[14]In Figs. 1(c), 1(d), and 1(g) we have used the high-resolution six-prong events only; in Figs. 1(h) and 2(c) through 2(f) we have used the five- and six-prong events. For the 3π channel, three- and four-prong events have been used throughout. Appropriate corrections have been applied to the branching ratios.

ERRATA

EXCITATION OF GIANT RESONANCES IN ^{58}Ni VIA INELASTIC SCATTERING OF POLARIZED PROTONS. D. C. Kocher, F. E. Bertrand, E. E. Gross, R. S. Lord, and E. Newman [Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 1070 (1973)].

In Fig. 2, the DWBA predictions for the analyzing power were inadvertently plotted with the wrong sign. The data points are plotted correctly. Thus, we find that the analyzing power in the region $E_x \approx 14.6$–16.7 MeV gives better agreement with the $E0$ prediction than with the $E2$ prediction, while the cross section in the region $E_x \approx 12.7$–23.7 MeV (see Fig. 3) shows a preference for an $E2$ assignment. We are currently investigating possible causes of this ambiguity.

The authors are indebted to G. R. Satchler for bringing this error to our attention.

DIFFERENTIAL CROSS SECTIONS IN $\pi^- p \to K^0\Lambda^0$ AND $\pi^- p \to K^0\Sigma^0$ FROM 3 TO 6 GeV/c. C. E. W. Ward, I. Ambats, A. Lesnik, W. T. Meyer, D. R. Rust, and D. D. Yovanovitch [Phys. Rev. Lett. **31**, 1149 (1973)].

In Ref. 5, read "A. Bashian *et al.* ...," instead of "A. Abashian *et al.* ... ."