

# GAPS IN THE GAP LAW

Draft for discussion

**EXCLUSIVE** to members of **LEADERSCLUB**

To obtain the full report please contact [infopro@infopro.com.lb](mailto:infopro@infopro.com.lb)

## **Content**

<b>Preamble</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Advantages</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>General Weaknesses</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Specific Articles</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Economic Impact of the Draft Law</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Appendix A: Key Points of the Law</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix B: Excluded Deposits</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Appendix C: Rebutting Retroactivity</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>Appendix D: Diverging Views of Key Stakeholders</b>	<b>52</b>



## Preamble



### **Why we are breaking our silence on the distribution of losses – the gap law**

The moment bank deposits are mentioned, reason gives way to reflex. The debate over bank deposits rarely advances beyond accusation. Anyone who dares to express an opinion is swiftly accused of being paid by banks, by George Soros, or by foreign powers; of pushing a communist or some other imagined ideological agenda; of plotting to replace the banking sector; of defending the deep state; of participating in an American or Israeli conspiracy to destroy the economy; or of some other nonsense. What rarely occurs is an actual discussion of the opinion itself. Opinions are not weighed; they are branded. Voices are not challenged; they are discredited. What is lost in this noise is the possibility of reasoned disagreement, or even the search for common ground.

Faced with this discouraging atmosphere, we have until now largely stayed on the sidelines of the shouting matches over bank deposits, unwilling to participate in a spectacle that too often resembles a murky soap opera rather than a forum for truth and solutions. Over the past six years, we have focused on the bigger picture, advocating a comprehensive economic approach rather than a piecemeal, deposit-driven restructuring of the banking sector.