

---

Subject: [bug] UPP doesn't see B: virtual drive  
Posted by [Mindtraveller](#) on Tue, 14 Aug 2007 12:40:33 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

[UPDATED 15/aug/07]

In my WindowsXP SP2 PROJECTS dir is mounted to B: virtual drive (with subst GUI analog - xsubst).

All the applications do see B:.

But neither UPP IDE nor any UPP apps do. They just don't see it at all. I think it's somehow connected with internal drive scanning subsystem of UPP.

---

---

Subject: Re: [bug] UPP doesn't see B: virtual drive  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 17 Aug 2007 17:39:03 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Definitely. Drive B: is explicitly canceled

Anyway, this is sort of ghost from the past, when MSDOS reported "virtual" B: drive even when there was none; selecting this drive usually ended in trouble, with console prompts in GUI apps etc...

Should we reenable B:? Frankly, I guess most computers start with C: nowadays...

---

---

Subject: Re: [bug] UPP doesn't see B: virtual drive  
Posted by [Mindtraveller](#) on Fri, 17 Aug 2007 21:03:19 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I would say there's hell lot of situations when A: and/or B: exists: system restore CDs (where "diskette" drives are emulated with CD/DVD dirs), optical drives, on-board flash drives (some systems start from on-board flash with totally hacked Windows versions, adopted for industrial automatics), etc.

I think, that if user WANTS to select B: and knows about some delay - it's his problem. But we, programmers, must give him this option.

Or else it would be frankly to write in manual's 1st page: "Here's my mega-totally-cool highly OOP-oriented cross-platform framework with great abilities, which... doesn't see B: drive at all."

Explicit cancelling for B: is definitely not obvious feature for user (and programmer). Then, why B:? Why not A: & B:? After all I suppose this is some effect of making really global framework: some configurations need things, which other computers don't. It's OK. Is it right to deprive users for their unusual config for it's easy not to do that? I'd say, no, it isn't.

P.S. I really consider U++ "ega-totally-cool highly OOP-oriented cross-platform framework with great abilities" It just needs some polishing in a number of ways, to start a little victorious procession for occupying frameworks niche. )

---

---

Subject: Re: [bug] UPP doesn't see B: virtual drive  
Posted by [mezise](#) on Fri, 17 Aug 2007 22:00:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

I haven't seen B drive in years but yes, it should be configurable in some way. Mindtraveller, would you contribute to that matter and propose any solution? What would be suitable for you keeping in mind Upp applications of other programmers/users?

Michal

---

---

Subject: Re: [bug] UPP doesn't see B: virtual drive  
Posted by [mirek](#) on Sat, 18 Aug 2007 08:27:00 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Well, you can try this: (Core/path.cpp):

```
Array<FileSystemInfo::FileInfo> FileSystemInfo::Find(String mask, int max_count) const
{
    Array<FileInfo> fi;
    if(IsNull(mask))
    { // root
#ifdef PLATFORM_WINCE
        FileInfo& f = fi.Add();
        f.filename = "\\";
        f.root_style = ROOT_FIXED;
#elif defined(PLATFORM_WIN32)
        char drive[4] = "?:\\";
        for(int c = 'A'; c <= 'Z'; c++) {
            *drive = c;
            int n = GetDriveType(drive);
            if(n == DRIVE_NO_ROOT_DIR/* || IsWin32() && *drive == 'B'*/) continue;
```

(The change is the commenting out the test for B in the last line).

---