

## Re: VB Compiler Warnings & other woes ...

**Source:**

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.vb/2004-07/1104.html>

---

**From:** guy ([guy\\_at\\_discussions.microsoft.com](mailto:guy_at_discussions.microsoft.com))

**Date:** 07/05/04

Date: Sun, 4 Jul 2004 23:51:01 -0700

looks like MS thinks you are wrong Richard

>*From vs2005 by newsgroup post...*

Subject: function return values

From: "[MS]John@data.vb" <[anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com](mailto:anonymous@discussions.microsoft.com)> Sent: 7/2/2004 12:56:27 PM

Yes, you will get this warning in vs 2005. Check this feature out in the beta1.

Also you will get a green squiggle in the function with nice tooltips to indicate what is going on.

John@data.vb

This posting is provided "AS IS" with no warranties, and confers no rights.

.

sorry for the cross post (dotnet.general....)

It would be really nice if we could have an Option VeryStrict (or similar) that caused a compilation warning or error for function calls that did not assign return values

eg

```
Split(MyString, ",")
```

instead of

```
MyArray = Split(MyString, ",")
```

The time overhead of having to type Bitbucket= ... when i dont need the return value would be more than recovered by having bugs trapped at compile time rather than runtime.

cheers

gu

.

"Richard Myers" wrote:

>  
>> *I think I was unable to make myself clear.*  
>  
> *Yup!*  
>  
>>  
>> *What I meant was that " By Default " the language should be as rigid as*  
> *C# –*  
>> *atleast at compiler level.*  
>  
> *You've completely overlooked the fact the C# is a new language. It doesn;t*  
> *have a direct legacy language path of evolution to consider. VB.Net does. I*  
> *suggest you step out from behind your own monitor and look at the big*  
> *picture.... from Microsofts point of view...rather than just your own.*  
>  
>  
>> *And you might be allowed to write as crappy code as possible to make it*  
>> *flexible and to support VB6 code which I suppose is what you prefer under*  
>> *the flag of FLEXIBILITY.*  
>  
> *Well again, that would be your connotation....your the one with the problem.*  
> *If you want to rewrite the upgrade wizard for Microsoft so that it does a*  
> *perfect conversion then im sure they would be willing to pay you.*  
>  
>> *Have you seen the writing on the wall, it clearly says that Microsoft is*  
>> *trying to promote VB as an inferior language as compared to C# despite the*  
>> *reality.*  
>  
> *Your contradicting yourself here. Despite what reality?*  
>  
>> *Why is it so that the recent Data Structures Articles on MSDN are made*  
> *using*  
>> *C# ONLY ???*  
>> *Why most of the Controls and Class Libraries are written in C# ???*  
>> *Why in the casestudies section of Microsoft site, its hard to find a*  
>> *solution in VB.NET ???*  
>  
> *Perhaps because VB.Net has a natural audience, VB6 programmers. Whereas C#*  
> *being a new langauge does not. In order to attract Java developers to the*  
> *..Net platform Microsoft overemphasises C#. Its good business sense.*  
> *And as for controls and class libraries... who cares? Its all MSIL by the i*  
> *use it anyway?*  
>

> > *Thats what i was referring to – VB is made to look like a language that  
> > makes toys. Everyone knows that the only diefference between VB and C# is  
> that of syntax  
> > and unsafe code. Even then this biased promotion is both frustating and  
> uncomprehendable.*  
>  
> *Well i disagree with half of that and dont understand what you've said in  
> the other half.*  
>  
>  
> > *I am really sorry in advance but I beleive your first and last comments  
> are  
> > a direct attack on my credibility and competence ....*  
>  
> *Im sure the VB.Net could feel the same about your post.*  
>  
> > *Well I am not aware if you have ever worked on any large project  
> comprising  
> > of large number of developers and modules.  
> > In such scenarios, you need a little help from the compiler – which is  
> > priceless when you are debugging.*  
>  
> *And we get plenty. The size of the project is a misnomer. Any half wit  
> systems architect is going to functionally decompose his project into  
> managable chunks. To suggest that there is something wrong with the language  
> because it doesn;t spoonfeed you your code is a classic case of the poor  
> workman blaming his tools. If your projects are that unweildy, sack your SA.*  
>  
> *Lets say it did force a 'Return'. What happens if the variable your  
> returning is nothing i.e it hasn;t been initialised. You've still got  
> precisely the same problem, and this can only be detected at runtime. Its  
> not the compilers fault the developer is sloppy. So what difference does it  
> make? Thats why we unit test, right?*  
>  
> > *What are compiler warnings – they are clues that there might be something  
> > wrong.  
> > Every one can make a mistake. That mistake can result in frustation and  
> time  
> > spent debugging the code.*  
>  
> *No kidding.*  
>  
> > *Some of these mistakes can easily be tackled by compiler warnings.*  
>  
> *Well as above different error, same problem. You still have to test and i'd  
> sack anybody who had trouble finding such a basic error. I mean really, a  
> function that doesn't return a value, shouldn;t even make it to the testers,  
> thats just piss poor coding and no one will convince me other wise.*  
>  
> > *In C++ , its is a recommended practice that you write your code to promote  
> > compile time errors rather than runtime.*

>  
> *But this is VB.Net? C++ might as well be from another planet.*  
>  
> > *And I hope you wont deny the fact that Runtime Errors are far more  
> difficult*  
> > *to catch and fix rather than simple Compile Time Errors.*  
>  
> *Generally speaking sure..... but you're talking about a very specific  
> runtime error and for that Ive gotta say "C'mon"?*  
>  
> > *And I hope you understand that my idea of TOY was by no means based on  
> what*  
> > *I develop with VB.NET , rather what is promoted.*  
> >  
>  
> *Well obviously i completely disagree. Your right I know nothing of you,  
> wouldn;t know you from a bar of soap, but im always sceptical about anyone  
> claiming to be pushing the boundaries of any language. Aren;t you just  
> contridicting yourself.... on the one hand you say "All Microsoft is  
> allowing us to build with such a \*your beliefs\* second rate language is TOYS  
> and then in the same breath you go onto say "but i develop so much more than  
> just TOYS".*  
>  
> *If so then whats your problem?*  
>  
> *Richard*  
>  
>  
>  
>