Subject: Allow empty CONTAINS part (hopefully done)
From: Van Snyder
Reference: 03-258r1, section 2.5, 04-189

1 Number

TBD

2 Title

Allow empty CONTAINS part.

3 Submitted By

J3

4 Status

For consideration.

5 Basic Functionality

Allow empty CONTAINS part.

6 Rationale

Is there a good reason that a module, procedure or type definition has to have procedure definitions after the CONTAINS statement? What would be hurt by allowing not to have any? Sometimes when programs are generated automatically, they end up with an empty CONTAINS part, and then you have to go fix it manually, or whine (ineffectually) to the unsympathetic guys who wrote the processor (if they're still in business), for which you have no source code. It's also not unreasonable to start off development of a module or type with an empty CONTAINS part, with the intent of filling it in later.

7 Estimated Impact

Trivial. Change a few syntax rules. No new words needed anywhere. Estimated at J3 meeting 169 to be at 3 on the JKR scale.

8 Detailed Specification

Allow an empty CONTAINS part in external and module procedures, modules, and derived type definitions.

8.1 Suggested edits

The following edits, which are believed to be complete, illustrate the triviality of the proposal.

[Editor: Delete.]	10:24
[Editor: Delete.]	10:29
[Editor: Delete.]	56:4
[Editor: Delete.]	250:14

9 History