

Re: Building from existing files – was Bypassing the Conversion Wi

Source: <http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/VC/microsoft.public.vc.mfc/2009-03/msg00832.html>

- *From:* Paul Hager <paul.hager@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 31 Mar 2009 06:17:02 -0700
-

I do appreciate the assistance and I'll certainly provide more details should I have a problem in the future – as I did with the posting for the C4267 problem.

With respect to this particular project, you are correct that the software is obsolete. So is the hardware – it was already approaching obsolescence when it began to be installed on USN combat vessels in the late 1970's. The economics of doing a complete rewrite of the software are prohibitive. This is not an option. It is not my choice. I have developed a separate, stand alone piece of software that does follow current (as of VS 2005) Microsoft practice. It's a lot cleaner than the 12-year-old software at issue here and it also performs the same I/O substantially faster.

I've checked around and I'm the only person here at Crane who doing maintenance/development using Microsoft – everyone else appears to be using Linux. That makes it more difficult since there is no one here to consult – I'm left with consulting with people online. Another difficulty is that because much of the work is secret, I have no internet access in the lab and that means that any online help necessitates leaving the lab and going to my workstation.

While this particular piece of code is not secret, I'm still loath to post large swatches of code online. And, in this particular instance, there really wasn't a need to post more than I did in order to answer this one question. I trust we agree that it is best to strive for parsimony whenever possible.

Regards,
Paul Hager

--
Maritime Electronic Warfare, Crane NSWC

"Joseph M. Newcomer" wrote:

They disappeared because your code is obsolete. You should upgrade the code to be consistent with modern practice.

Re: Building from existing files – was Bypassing the Conversion Wi

You continue the poor posting practice by given an example that uses a variable whose declaration is not shown.

When you post an example, you **will** show the declarations of all of your variables!

You have not justified why you are using the obsolete data type 'char' to represent text, or why 300 makes sense (for example, a CString would probably be a better choice). But if you read the definition of strlen, it states that it is

```
size_t strlen(const char * str);
```

so it means that strlen is returning a size_t. A size_t can be 64 bits wide, therefore, using an int variable (and I'm only guessing, since you couldn't be bothered to show us the declaration) you should have been using a size_t variable.

Reading the documentation always helps.
joe

On Mon, 30 Mar 2009 09:37:03 -0700, Paul Hager
<paul.hager@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

I already acknowledged I should have provided an example. Once I set the Project Properties as indicated, the code compiled and the C2665 errors disappeared.

Unless there is a good reason to change the code, I see no advantage in it. Is there a good reason?

As for the other error, it is C4267 and it arises as follows:

```
char temp[300];  
...  
j = strlen(temp) - 1; // C4267 error size_t to int
```

I assume there is a switch that will handle this as well. Since strlen is a standard C function I can't think of any reason why this shouldn't work as written. And, I reiterate, it does compile correctly in both the (currently running) 4.2 version and the VS 2005 conversion wizard output.

Joseph M. Newcomer [MVP]
email: newcomer@xxxxxxxxxxxxx
Web: <http://www.flounder.com>
MVP Tips: http://www.flounder.com/mvp_tips.htm