

You really think it is? Well, I haven't known but I've wondered because they told me six years ago that if you want to come under Social Security, you can do so. And they said we'll deduct a certain amount from your salary and turn it in to the government and you can come under. And I but if he does then everybody has

So I said, "All right" and agreed to it and Dr. came to the age and started collecting. So it was really thanks to him

Now all of a sudden last spring they told me they've decided in Washington that if you're an ordained man you can't be under that - so that everything that I've paid in for six years counts for nothing. Now they said, "What you've paid for the last four years, they can get that back voluntarily now, you can't be under it.

You have to be under it

because you're ordained." Well, I thought if you could be in it for six years and they could it around like that, I sort of felt it wasn't a very trustworthy thing to be in But you feel that it is a good

thing? (Student question) Of course, the difficulty there is again you're giving some government bureaucrats some power but of course if it represents so many people why maybe it doesn't have the same danger, does it. I don't know. (Student question)

That's right. Yes. Well maybe I should have come under it. I think the day's gone now, isn't it, when you can? I think I'll just forget it for now. Well let's go on to

E now. E is that the Acts and the Epistles where they speak of an authority within a local church always speak of a plurality of ~~opinion~~ ^{officials}. This is a very interesting fact. The Acts

and the Epistles where they speak of authority within a local church always speak of a plurality of officials. A few illustrations of that - I think we've looked at all of them before

but perhaps not to bring out this particular point. In Acts 14:23 we find, "And when they had ordained them elders in every church" - . Now how much change would it take in the

Greek to make that elders in all the churches with the suggestion of being only one elder?

I don't know but as it stands it would seem to be "elders in every church" which seems to

mean more than one elder in a church. "When they had ordained them elders in every church" - now maybe not, maybe there could be some church with only one elder and still say it this

way. But it certainly suggests that the normal thing was having more than one elder in a

church. "When they had ordained them elders in every church" certainly suggests a plurality