

## Nevada Senate Bill 63, Nevada Youth Online Safety Act

### OPPOSITION TESTIMONY

March 18, 2025

#### Senate Commerce and Labor Committee

Dear Chair Pazina, Vice-Chair Daly and Members of the Senate Commerce and Labor Committee::

On behalf of NetChoice, a national trade association working to make the internet safe for free enterprise and free expression, we write to express our opposition to Senate Bill 63 which would prohibit young people from accessing social media without verifiable parental consent.

We share the sponsor's goal to better protect minors from harmful content online. NetChoice members have taken issues of teen safety seriously and in recent years have rolled out numerous new features, settings, parental tools, and protections to better empower parents and assist in monitoring their children's use of social media. We ask that you oppose SB 63 and instead use this bill as a way to jumpstart a larger conversation about how best to protect minors online and consider alternatives that do not raise constitutional issues.

#### Key Concerns:

1. SB 63 imposes unconstitutional age-verification and parental consent requirements;
2. The Supreme Court and lower courts have consistently held parental consent for accessing lawful speech online unconstitutional; and
3. Age-verification and parental consent presents heightened threats to privacy and undermines the state's interest in protecting the privacy of minors.

#### **SB 63's core provisions are unconstitutional and are already being actively litigated in other states:**

SB 63 faces substantial First Amendment challenges. The bill's age verification mandate for all users effectively creates a "digital ID card" requirement that infringes on adults' right to access constitutionally protected speech anonymously.

The bill's restrictions on minors' access to social media platforms raise First Amendment concerns by limiting their ability to access information and engage in protected speech. Courts have consistently recognized that minors have constitutional rights to receive information and ideas through various media. The bill's requirements would effectively create a barrier to constitutionally protected speech, as platforms would be required to verify age before allowing access to any content. This constitutes a prior restraint on speech, which courts have traditionally viewed with particular skepticism. Similar provisions have been challenged in federal court and laws in Utah, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Ohio are currently enjoined.

Additionally, the Supreme Court has invalidated parental consent requirements when they impermissibly chill access to lawful speech.<sup>1</sup> In *Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Association*, the Court struck down a California law restricting minors' access to violent video games without parental consent. The Court rejected the notion that a new category of unprotected speech could be created for speech directed at children, emphasizing that minors are entitled to significant First Amendment protection. Justice Scalia's majority opinion noted that the government cannot "restrict the ideas to which children may be exposed" simply because it disagrees with them.

When other courts have examined age-verification and parental consent laws, *Brown* governs. For example, when the District Court for the Southern District of Ohio reiterated that parental consent laws do not enforce parental authority but enforces *governmental* authority subject to a parental veto. "[Ohio's parental consent law] appears to be exactly that sort of law. And like content-based regulations, laws that require parental consent for children to access constitutionally protected, non-obscene content, are subject to strict scrutiny."<sup>2</sup>

### **Age-Verification and parental consent requirements undermine privacy and security:**

While we share the legislature's goal of protecting young people online, SB 63's approach would create significant privacy and security concerns while potentially limiting beneficial online interactions for Nevada's youth.

Section 18's blanket prohibition on using minors' personal information in algorithmic recommendation systems would severely degrade online experiences for young users. This provision fails to distinguish between harmful content amplification and beneficial algorithmic systems that help users discover educational content, safety information, and supportive communities. By allowing only "contextual information delivery" based on the current page being viewed, the bill would effectively return teens to a pre-2000s internet experience. Modern platforms rely on algorithms to filter out inappropriate content, surface relevant educational materials, and create age-appropriate experiences. Without these

---

<sup>1</sup> *Brown v. Entertainment Merchants Ass'n*, 564 U.S. 786 (2011).

<sup>2</sup> *NetChoice v. Yost*, 716 F. Supp. 3d 539, 558 (S.D. Ohio 2024).

tools, platforms would be forced to either show unfiltered chronological content—potentially exposing minors to more harmful material—or significantly limit functionality for all Nevada teens.

Additionally, the bill's 95% accuracy requirement for age verification is technologically unfeasible. No existing age verification system consistently achieves this threshold without highly invasive data collection. The bill's requirements would force platforms to collect sensitive personal information from both minors and parents in order to actually establish the relationship, thus creating new data security vulnerabilities. This runs counter to best practices of data minimization and could make Nevada residents more susceptible to identity theft and fraud.

As we have seen, no number of safeguards can ensure against data breaches. According to Child Identity Fraud Reports from Javelin Strategy and Research, nearly 2 million children were victims of identity theft in 2022<sup>3</sup>. Meanwhile, the 2019 hack of Pearson (a school technology provider) exposed information of thousands of children, including their names, birthdates, and email addresses.<sup>4</sup> Even government agencies responsible for storing personal information have been subject to massive data leaks.<sup>5</sup> Mandating that websites or services collect sensitive personal data on minors as a precondition for accessing vast swaths of online speech substantially increases these risks. They also make websites juicier targets for hackers.

Accordingly, state legislatures should evaluate whether their proposed policies would advance privacy protections or simply subject minors and adults to greater vulnerability in their online lives.

\*\*\*

Given the constitutional and policy problems presented by age-verification and parental consent, NetChoice urges you to oppose SB 63 to avoid identical constitutional pitfalls. Instead, we respectfully ask you to work with industry stakeholders to develop more effective approaches to protecting young people online while preserving their privacy and access to beneficial digital services. As always, we offer ourselves as a resource to discuss any of these issues with you in more detail.

Sincerely,

Amy Bos

Director of Federal and State Affairs

*NetChoice is a trade association that works to protect free expression and promote free enterprise online*

---

<sup>3</sup> Javelin, *1.7 Million U.S. Children Fell Victim to Data Breaches According to Javelin's 2022 Child Identity Fraud Study*, (Oct. 26, 2022) (last visited Mar. 22, 2024),

<sup>4</sup> Lindsay McKenzie, *Pearson Hack Exposes Thousands of Students' Data*, INSIDE HIGHER ED (Aug. 4, 2019), <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/08/05/pearson-hack-exposes-thousands-students%E2%80%99-data>.

<sup>5</sup> Sean Lyngaas, *Millions of Americans' personal data exposed in global hack*, CNN POLITICS, June 16, 2023, <https://www.cnn.com/2023/06/16/politics/cyberattack-us-government/index.html>.

