SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

No. 08–1301

THOMAS CARR, PETITIONER *v.* UNITED STATES

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

[June 1, 2010]

JUSTICE SCALIA, concurring in part and concurring in the judgment.

I join the Court's opinion except for Part III–C. I do not join that part because only the text Congress voted on, and not unapproved statements made or comments written during its drafting and enactment process, is an authoritative indicator of the law. But even if those preenactment materials were relevant, it would be unnecessary to address them here. The Court's thorough discussion of text, context, and structure, *ante*, at 5–17, demonstrates that the meaning of 18 U. S. C. §2250(a) is plain. As the Court acknowledges, *ante*, at 18, but does not heed, we must not say more:

> "We have stated time and again that courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there. When the words of a statute are unambiguous, then, this first canon is also the last: judicial inquiry is complete." *Connecticut Nat. Bank* v. *Germain*, 503 U. S. 249, 253–254 (1992) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted).