

## HB 343:

### **One Insurance Premium - One Benefit Two Premiums - Two Benefits**

- On May 2, 1997, the day the anti-stacking bill took effect, every Montana family that owned more than one car was affected.  
If you owned: 2 cars – Premiums stay the same, **HALF** the coverage.  
3 cars – Premiums stay the same, **1/3** the coverage.
- On April 18, 2003, the Montana Supreme Court held in Hardy v. Progressive Specialty Insurance Company, that when an insurer collects a separate uninsured motorist premium for each vehicle an insured owns, the insurer is required to pay claims for each separate premium collected. In other words, Hardy was allowed to stack the uninsured motorist benefits from each of his three premiums.
- It is fair and reasonable that a person who pays an insurance premium should be allowed to collect on that policy when a claim arises.
- The market will regulate itself in terms of fair premiums and pay-outs. If a company does not want policies stacked, the company will charge a single premium and pay a single benefit. However, if multiple premiums are charged, multiple benefits will accrue. This is a market based solution that has worked in Montana for over a quarter century. Insurance companies are free to determine when to issue uninsured motorist policies, because it is optional coverage in Montana.
- Opponents of this bill will argue that if stacking is allowed, premiums will go up. Why then, when stacking was prohibited (from 1997 to 2003), premiums did not go down?
- FAIR is FAIR. Companies can solve this so-called “problem” themselves. One premium, one pay-out. But if they charge two premiums, they should pay for two.

**-Support HB 343 -  
You get what you pay for**