



The Honorable Mike Johnson
Speaker of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Hakeem Jeffries
Minority Leader of the House
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Brett Guthrie
Chairman
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Frank Pallone
Ranking Member
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

June 26, 2026

Dear Speaker Johnson, Minority Leader Jeffries, Chairman Guthrie, and Ranking Member Pallone,

CC: Members of the House of Representatives

We write as a coalition of young people, parents, experts, and organizations with deep concerns about the KIDS Act (H.R.7757) that is [reportedly](#) headed to the House floor next week.

We have fought for years to enact strong federal legislation that will protect the next generation online from the harms this generation has faced growing up on unregulated social media. We share the urgency you feel to pass legislation to protect our nation's young people online. However, **we respectfully urge you to reject the KIDS Act.** In March, we [wrote](#) to the leaders of the House Energy and Commerce Committee with strong reservations about that version of the bill that was marked up, urging you to reconsider many of the provisions that we believed would actively harm our young people, rather than protect them.

We are deeply disappointed that those concerns have not been addressed. The undersigned advocates have been readily available throughout this process to offer productive feedback to strengthen the legislation before you. Instead, the Committee rejected our concerns and opted to negotiate a version that let Big Tech off the hook and rush this legislation to the House floor.

We reiterate our concerns with the updated version of the KIDS Act:

The House bill removes the duty of care. The legal obligation for covered companies to design their platforms to be safe by default, ensuring that the design choices they make do not foster mental health harms, sexual exploitation, or financial exploitation of young people. The duty of care is critical because

the harm to young people is built into the design of these products, not stemming from content. The House bill removes it. Section 213(c)(2) provides that nothing in the Act may be construed to impose a duty of care on a covered platform. Major social media companies, the companies this bill regulates, are currently on trial across the country. The evidence in those cases — internal records prioritizing teen engagement over teen wellbeing, safety changes shelved because platforms would lose users, buried research on the benefits of disconnection shows the default poor choices of these companies when the law does not require otherwise. Stripping the duty of care does not lighten a regulatory burden; it removes the most important obligation requiring these products to be designed safely in the first place.

The bill’s substitution for the duty of care is ineffectual and abandons the harms that matter most.

In place of a duty of care, the House bill requires that a platform maintain “reasonable policies, practices, and procedures” addressing the harms. A platform can satisfy this without changing a single design choice. This thin requirement avoids addressing the harms at the center of this crisis. The bill’s list of harms in Section 213(a) does not include eating disorders, substance use disorders, suicidal behaviors, depression, or addiction. The consequence is stark: under the KIDS Act, platforms are not even required to have a policy addressing the harms that have devastated families, let alone to carry a stronger obligation to take reasonable measures to prevent them. To the families who have lost children to these exact harms, a bill that does not require a company so much as to maintain a policy about them is not a measured compromise. It is an insult to their loss.

The bill weakens the protections against compulsive use. The bill ties “compulsive usage” to use that “substantially limits one or more major life activities,” which withholds the obligation to limit compulsive design features until a child’s use has already reached a disabling level. Children should not have to be severely harmed before a platform is expected to stop engineering for compulsion. The bill compounds these harms by dropping the express requirement that platforms give young users access to a chronological, rather than algorithmic, feed. What remains is a narrow, easily buried opt-out from personalized recommendation systems, falling short of a guarantee of a genuine alternative to the engagement-maximizing algorithm.

The bill does not cover certain platforms that are known perpetrators of these harms. The bill covers a far smaller set of platforms than the harms require. It leaves out online video games, messaging applications, and video streaming services, even though bullying, grooming, and exploitation occur in game worlds, virtual reality environments, and private messaging, not only on traditional social media. The House bill removes those express categories. Instead, Section 201 sets out a narrow definition targeted at social media, with “requirements” operating as a series of exemptions, rather than protections, while online games are diverted into a separate section with weaker protections. A platform such as Roblox, which has become [a notorious site of both sexual exploitation and financial exploitation of children](#), falls outside the bill, and therefore, the safeguards do not apply to it at all. An alleged children’s safety law that does not cover the most dangerous platforms will not protect the children using them.

The bill’s AI chatbots and companion chatbots provisions do not meaningfully protect against known harms. The bill only requires chatbot providers to maintain reasonable policies and practices addressing a narrow set of issues. Its treatment of addiction is especially indefensible. There are no protections against dangerous human-like AI design features that foster emotional dependence, such as

simulations of sentience, desires, and personal relationships with minors. The sole operative requirement, in Section 405(1), is that a provider establish policies and procedures. In other words, the House's solution for federal legislation in response to addictive AI companionship is a mere suggestion that a child take a break after three uninterrupted hours of staring at a screen.

It pains us that, given how hard we have fought for a strong federal solution to online child protection and for a strong bill to move to the House floor, the KIDS Act is the bill the House is championing. We cannot support the KIDS Act and urge you to reject it and prevent it from going to the House floor for a vote. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to discuss needed changes to this bill. But until these concerns are addressed, we oppose this bill.

With conviction,

Design It For Us
National Center on Sexual Exploitation
ParentsTogether Action
Young People's Alliance

24th Century Education
AFT
Alexander Neville Foundation
All Girls Allowed
All4Ed
Alliance to Counter Crime Online
Allies Against Slavery
American Youth Association
ANEW Life International
Arizona Anti-Trafficking Network
Beauty from Ashes Ministry
Blue Rising
Bodhi's Moon
Breaking Generational Cycles
California Survivor Coalition
Center for Countering Digital Hate
Child First Policy Center
Children's Advocacy Institute
Coalition Against Trafficking in Women
Common Sense Media
Demand Progress
Dominion Ridge Group
Edith's House
EdTech Law Center PLLC
Encode AI
Equip Our Kids!

Erik's Cause
Exodus Cry
Global Emancipation Network
Global Hope 365
Got4titude
Guardian Tech Alliance
Heat Initiative
Hickey Family Foundation
Honey Brown Hope Foundation
Human Trafficking Prevention Alliance
In Our Backyard
InnovateEDU
International Protection Alliance
Issue One
Just Love Worldwide
Justice Restoration Center
Less Than 3
Lynn's Warriors
MAP Ann Arbor
Mentari
Michigan Parent Alliance for Safe Schools
MindShiftED Parent Institute
Minnesota Family Council
Mothers Against Media Addiction (MAMA)
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)
National Children's Alliance
National Criminal Justice Training Center (NCJTC)
National Parents Union
NH Traffick-Free Coalition
Nurses United Against Human Trafficking
PACT (Protect All Children from Trafficking)
Paradigm Shift Training and Consulting
Parent Impact
ParentsRISE!
Project STAND
Protect Young Eyes
Proxyware
Pulse Arts
Rescuing Hope
Rights4Girls
Sacred Stewardship
Safe Exit Initiative
Safe House Project
ScreenStrong

Shared Hope International
Shield North Carolina
Sierra Cares Foundation
South Carolina Family First
South Carolina Federation of Republican Women
Street Grace
Survivor Leader Network of San Diego
Survivor-Led Solutions
The Carson J. Bride Effect
The Set Free Movement
The Tech Oversight Project
TJP Advocacy
UltraViolet Action
Utah Parents United
Wake Equity & Justice Coalition
Wired Human
World Without Exploitation
Yellowstone Human Trafficking Task Force
Zoe Ministries of DE