Quote:Just don`t get me wrong: I develop nearly real-time applications (not RTA actually at all when we discuss Windows issues). I do work with actual hardware devices with a number of protocols. It all runs under highly truncated version of Windows, which doesn`t know much of system-hanging device drivers like CD-ROM ones. So, generally we have no big problems with OS latensy on protocol timeouts like 50-500 msecs.
This way neither Java or .NET, nor similar "heavy" platforms can be used (usually those industrial computers are not that quick as Pentium3/4 to support virtual machines, and memory installed may be below even 64/128 MB).
I understand that and I was not trying to convince you to use GC on those machines. I was just giving arguments that a generic GC on a modern PC or similar hardware can save a lot of pain. You can live without it, doing all the memory management manually like in other frameworks, you can give smart pointers from BOOST a shot, you can use something like U++ or you can use GC (even with C++; AFAIK D GC is available/inspired by the C++ GC). For people with a lot of experience and good technical know-how, it's just a matter of compromise between choice and the needs of the project. Yet really knowledgeable C++ programmers are not that common, and managers often have teams formed of a little less experienced programmers. These are the people who introduce memory leaks and who misuse language features, not the guys who can perfectly understand were complex template code with multiple inheritance, virtual inheritance and some hidden macro-magic at the first glance. In such situations, GC can be a good alternative. Also, training time and cost for these programmers is reduced and there are people who refuse to go all the way and acquire full C++ feature knowledge, remaining in a "C with classes + some design patterns(+ use of the STL without really understanding it; still so many hand written vectors, lists, etc. in commercial code)"