and discussions of mine at this point in order to demonstrate that there are abundant source materials on the true-coral reefs and evaporite strata of the oil fields, which creationists could be studying. (They could even be studying many of the drilling cores and other samples from these geologic formations if they so desired.) But instead of studying such formations or the research reports describing them the creationist leaders seem to be content to depend on only a few casual bits of information which they pick up occasionally. They have also badly erred in supposing that the reefs and evaporites in all of the oil fields are the same as those which they have seen exposed at the surface in Texas and New Mexico.

As a result of such lack of knowledge of the data, and of similar wrong assumptions, Morris sums up the present young-earth creationist position in the following words:

> As far as coral reefs are concerned, it should be realized that fossil "reefs" are probably not reefs at all.... A true coral reef contains the binding framework of the coral organisms themselves. Fossil reefs, however are "inorganically" bound, not "bioconstructed." That is, the evidence indicates that coral and other fossil organisms were simply transported into place by sedimentary processes.... (Morris, 1983, p. 8-9).

It is extremely disappointing to read such statements from persons who are trying to represent honest, "scientific creationism" and true Christianity. If they had any idea of the actual nature of the geologic formations they are dismissing as unimportant, and of the strata which cover them, they would surely bow their heads in shame--for, there are many unbelieving scientists watching us now. (And most of them are accusing us, not just of fanaticism, but of dishonesty.) Even if there were some way to ignore the great mass of data which demonstrates that many coral reefs in Alberta and Michigan really were "bioconstructed" by natural growth processes, and to agree with Morris's statement that they were "simply transported into place by sedimentary processes," where would we go from there? How would we explain the thousands of feet of non-flood-produced sedimentary strata which lie above the reefs and have to be penetrated by drilling before the petroleum can be extracted?

Table 1 (on the next page) gives the approximate thicknesses of the main types of strata which lie above the reefs in northwestern Alberta. Of the layers listed in this table, only the upper 100 feet and the sandstone parts (in the Cretaceous and in the upper part of the Devonian) are types of deposit which could have been laid down by rapidly moving water. None of the evaporite covering (lower part of the Devonian) and practically none of the limestone, dolostone, or shale strata could have been formed during or following the Flood. (The reasons that they could not have been are described at length in Wonderly, 1987, p. 27-31, 33-36, 72-82, 95-96.) Though there are many destructive actions which can be accomplished by floodwaters, we have to recognize that the ability of a flood to construct extensive sequences of neatly arranged, delicate layers of fine-grained sediments is practically nil. This is particularly true of the 700 feet of evaporite coverings above the Alberta reefs, as explained in Wonderly, 1987, p. 72-82, 86-96. If anyone suggests that the array of sedimentary formations (listed in the above table) lying above the Alberta reefs might have been deposited after the Flood it is because they have forgotten to reckon with at least two facts: First, Genesis 8:13 emphatically states that at the end of the Flood year, the earth quickly became "dried" returning to normal; and second, the Flood was a recent event, not leaving time for the deposition of anything like the quantity and expanse of sedimentary rock which covers the oil deposits of Alberta, and of