

# Re: Requesting sample code!

---

*Source:* <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VC/microsoft.public.vc.language/2008-11/msg00135.html>

---

- *From:* "Igor Tandetnik" <[itandetnik@xxxxxxxx](mailto:itandetnik@xxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 6 Nov 2008 13:06:03 -0500
- 

Guido Franzke <[guidof73@xxxxxxxx](mailto:guidof73@xxxxxxxx)> wrote:

I think, if you declare a struct this way:

```
typedef struct strMystr
{
  int m_i1, m_i2;
  int get_values(int& i1, int& i2);
} SMystr;
```

then a constructor is not made automatically by the compiler (?).

Technically it is. But since it's a trivial constructor and doesn't do anything, you might not find any traces of it in the generated machine code.

```
class SMystr
{
  public: // a public class
  int m_i1, m_i2;
  int get_values(int& i1, int& i2);
};
```

But in a class like here the compiler generates default constructor, destructor, operator=.

I don't know exactly what happens with structs.

The same thing.

—

With best wishes,  
Igor Tandetnik

With sufficient thrust, pigs fly just fine. However, this is not necessarily a good idea. It is hard to be sure where they are going to land, and it could be dangerous sitting under them as they fly overhead. — RFC 1925

Re: Requesting sample code!