

Constitutional Recognition of Parliamentary Opposition in Algeria between Text and Practice

الإعتراف الدستوري بالمعارضة البرلمانية في الجزائر بين النص والممارسة

HADDAD Abdelaziz

Faculty of Law

University of Algiers 1 - Algeria

haddadh173@gmail.com

1. حداد عبد العزيز *

كلية الحقوق

جامعة الجزائر 1 - الجزائر

haddadh173@gmail.com

1. BENABBOU Fatiha

Faculty of Law

University of Algiers 1 - Algeria

benabbou54@yahoo.fr

2. بن عبوفتيحة

كلية الحقوق

جامعة الجزائر 1 - الجزائر

benabbou54@yahoo.fr

Submission date: 01/08/2025

Date of acceptance: 07/10/2025

ABSTRACT:

This article explores the status of the parliamentary opposition within the Algerian constitutional system, focusing on the 2020 constitutional amendment and its practical application. Although the opposition is explicitly recognized as an institutional component, the absence of complementary legislation, weak internal mechanisms, and the continued dominance of the majority hinder its effective role. It shows that the opposition remains largely symbolic, lacking real influence in both legislative and oversight functions. It concludes that genuine institutional balance requires

ملخص باللغة العربية:

يُعالج هذا المقال مسألة مكانة المعارضة البرلمانية في النظام الدستوري الجزائري، من خلال تحليل نصوص الدستور، خصوصًا تعديل 2020، ومقارنتها بالممارسة الفعلية داخل البرلمان. ورغم الاعتراف الصريح بالمعارضة كمكوّن مؤسّساتي، إلا أن غياب النصوص التنظيمية المكّملة، وضعف الآليات الداخلية، واستمرار هيمنة الأغلبية، كلها عوامل تُضعف تفعيل هذا الدور. كما يبيّن المقال أن المعارضة لا تزال تعاني من التمثيل الرمزي، وغياب الفاعلية التشريعية والرقابية. ويخلص إلى أن تحقيق التوازن المؤسّساتي

* المؤلف المرسل.

political will and concrete legal measures to transform the opposition into a true parliamentary actor, rather than a formal element of procedural democracy

Keywords: *Parliamentary Opposition, Algerian Constitution, Constitutional Recognition, Parliamentary Oversight, Political Pluralism*

يقتضي إرادة سياسية وتشريعات فعالة، تجعل من المعارضة شريكًا حقيقيًا في العمل البرلماني، لا مجرد واجهة ديمقراطية شكلية.

كلمات مفتاحية: المعارضة البرلمانية، الدستور الجزائري، الاعتراف الدستوري، الرقابة البرلمانية، التعددية السياسية

Introduction:

Across comparative constitutional systems, parliamentary opposition has long been considered a fundamental pillar of democratic governance. It plays a key role in ensuring institutional balance and holding the executive accountable. In the Algerian context, the position of the opposition within the legislature has undergone a notable evolution, particularly following recent constitutional amendments. The 2016 and 2020 revisions marked a shift from implicit marginalization toward explicit recognition of the parliamentary opposition as a constitutional institution vested with specific rights and responsibilities, as reflected in Articles 114 and 116. But this formal recognition has not been accompanied by a parallel transformation in the legal and institutional frameworks needed to guarantee the opposition's effective participation. Parliamentary practice in Algeria remains characterized by majority dominance, weak procedural safeguards, and a limited political culture of pluralism. These conditions raise a central question: To what extent has the Algerian constitutional order effectively institutionalized the parliamentary opposition as a functional actor? And what are the limits of implementing this recognition between constitutional principle and parliamentary reality ?

The relevance of this topic lies in its contemporary significance. Algeria has recently embarked on a series of political and constitutional reforms ostensibly aimed at reinforcing democratic principles and expanding institutional openness. In this context, the parliamentary opposition is not merely a political counterweight; it is a structural component of legislative transparency, oversight, and accountability. Strengthening its role could therefore contribute directly to the quality of parliamentary performance and institutional legitimacy.

To address the above question, this study adopts a critical analytical approach, combining textual interpretation of the relevant constitutional provisions with a contextual analysis of their practical application within the Algerian Parliament. Where appropriate, comparative references are drawn from other parliamentary systems to highlight convergences and divergences.

This inquiry is organized around the dichotomy between constitutional design and institutional practice:

First Topic: The Constitutional Framework of Parliamentary Opposition in Algeria

First Requirement: The Evolution of Parliamentary Opposition in Algerian Constitutions

Second Requirement: The Constitutional Rights Granted to the Opposition

Second Topic: The Limits of Implementing Constitutional Recognition in Practice

First Requirement: Legal and Institutional Challenges Facing the Opposition

Second Requirement: Weak Practical Implementation of the Opposition's Rights

THE FIRST TOPIC

The Constitutional Framework of Parliamentary Opposition in Algeria

The constitutional recognition of the parliamentary opposition in Algeria emerged through a gradual evolution shaped by the country's political transformations over the past two decades. To properly assess this recognition, it is necessary to examine the development of the opposition's status within successive constitutional texts, followed by a deeper analysis of the rights granted to it under the 2020 Constitution, to understand both the scope and limitations of this acknowledgment. This section will address these issues through two focused requirements

First Requirement:

The Evolution of The Parliamentary Opposition's Status in Algerian Constitutions

The constitutional trajectory of the parliamentary opposition in Algeria reveals a gradual development toward the formal recognition of this institution as a fundamental component of the political system. Historically, the earlier constitutions failed to explicitly acknowledge the role or legal standing of parliamentary opposition within the legislative framework¹ this neglect reflected a dominant majoritarian logic that marginalized opposition voices and overlooked political pluralism in parliamentary practice.

Before the 2016 constitutional amendment, the Algerian constitutions, including the seminal 1989 Constitution, which introduced formal political pluralism, did not enshrine any

1 Boumesbah Wasilla, *The Status of Parliamentary Opposition in Comparative Constitutions*, Journal of Political Science and Law, Arab Democratic Center, Berlin, Volume 3, Issue 13, January 2019, p. 276.

provision that explicitly defined or regulated the status of the opposition within the legislature. The focus remained predominantly on empowering the majority, thereby reinforcing a centralized legislative structure that left little institutional space for dissenting parliamentary groups¹.

A turning point emerged with the constitutional amendment of 2016, which responded to growing political and civil demands for a more balanced distribution of power within Parliament. For the first time in Algerian constitutional history, Article 114 acknowledged the parliamentary opposition². It granted it a set of rights designed to ensure its effective participation in legislative and political affairs. The provision states:

“The parliamentary opposition contributes to the parliamentary proceedings and political life. It shall enjoy rights that enable it to exercise its activities, monitor government action, participate in the drafting of legislation, refer matters to the Constitutional Court, and engage in parliamentary diplomacy, by the law and the internal rules of both chambers.” This marked a shift from constitutional silence to what may be termed “positive constitutionalization” the deliberate recognition of the opposition as an institutional actor in the parliamentary

1 Claude Leclerc, *Constitutional Law and Political Institutions*, tenth edition, Litec, 1999, p. 126.

2 A turning point emerged with the constitutional amendment of 2016, which responded to growing political and civil demands for a more balanced distribution of power within Parliament. For the first time in Algerian constitutional history, Article 114 of the 2016 Constitution explicitly recognized the parliamentary opposition, stating: “The parliamentary opposition is recognized and guaranteed effective participation in parliamentary work, particularly in legislative activity and oversight over government action.”

See: Article 114, Algerian Constitution of 2016.

process. It also signaled an effort by the constitutional legislator to recalibrate the power dynamics within the legislative body¹.

This evolution was further reinforced by the 2020 constitutional revision, particularly through Article 116², which expanded the scope of rights granted to the opposition. These included freedom of expression, access to public funding proportionate to parliamentary representation, active participation in legislative work, oversight of government activities, the right to propose parliamentary agendas, and representation in parliamentary organs, including the possibility of chairing certain committees. Even with the progressive tone of these texts, a critical reading reveals certain limitations. Many of the rights granted to the opposition are general and lack effective procedural mechanisms for their implementation. For instance, the right to propose legislation is not exclusive to the opposition; it is shared among all members of Parliament, thereby raising questions about its specificity as an opposition prerogative³.

Furthermore, the internal rules of the National People's Assembly have not been sufficiently revised to operationalize the constitutional provisions, particularly about opposition representation in decision bodies or the thresholds required for initiating motions of no confidence or parliamentary inquiries.

1 Re see: Article 114, Algerian Constitution of 2016.

2 This evolution was further reinforced by the 2020 constitutional revision, particularly through Article 116, which broadened the scope of parliamentary opposition rights by detailing its institutional role and guaranteeing access to parliamentary responsibilities.

See: Article 116, Algerian Constitution of 2020.

3 Ariane VIDAL-NAQUET, *The Institutionalization of the Opposition. What Status? For What Opposition?*, French Review of Constitutional Law, v. 1, no. 77, 2009, p. 159 Also See Constitutional Amendment 2016 Law No. 16/01 of March 6, 2016.

Even so, the mere constitutional enshrinement of the parliamentary opposition's rights, while undoubtedly a foundational step remains insufficient in itself. What emerges at this stage is the necessity of examining how these provisions are operationalized through ordinary legislation, parliamentary procedures, and actual political will. This raises important questions about the extent to which the formal constitutional acknowledgment has succeeded in reshaping institutional dynamics and rebalancing the relationship between majority and opposition within Algeria's legislative process¹.

Second Requirement:

The Constitutional Rights Granted to The parliamentary Opposition

The constitutional amendments of 2016 and 2020 marked a notable development in Algeria's parliamentary framework by establishing the parliamentary opposition not only as a political actor but also as a constitutional institution with recognized rights and functions. These rights aim to enable the opposition to carry out its role effectively within Parliament and to reinforce the principles of political pluralism and institutional balance².

1. Rights Related to Legislative Participation

Among the most prominent rights granted to the opposition is its involvement in legislative activity, specifically the power to propose and amend laws. Article 114 of the 2016 Constitution referred to the opposition's contribution to the preparation of legislation. Article 116 of the 2020 Constitution further expanded this role, allowing the opposition to engage

1 Malati Maamar, *Parliamentary Opposition in the Algerian Constitution*, Issue 17, Journal of Legal and Political Sciences, 2018, p. 487.

2 Boumesbah Wasilla, Op Cit p 279.

more directly in the legislative process. Even so, this right is not exclusive to the opposition. All members of Parliament are entitled to participate in proposing legislation, which raises questions about whether the opposition is granted any real procedural advantage. In practice, the conditions for exercising this right, such as the required number of supporting deputies, can limit the opposition's ability to submit bills independently. Without adjustments to these procedural thresholds, the legislative initiative of the opposition remains largely symbolic¹.

2. Rights Related to Government Oversight

The Constitution also allows the opposition to monitor executive activity using standard tools such as written and oral questions, interpellations, parliamentary inquiries, and no-confidence motions. Article 116 includes these mechanisms among the opposition's guaranteed rights. But these tools often face practical limitations. Formal requirements, including high quorum thresholds, can restrict access to such mechanisms, especially for smaller opposition groups. Also, the opposition frequently lacks sufficient political and media leverage to ensure that its oversight efforts lead to meaningful outcomes. In practice, the effectiveness of oversight is closely tied to political dynamics². The formal existence of these mechanisms does not automatically result in accountability. Without a supportive institutional culture that values checks and scrutiny, opposition efforts risk being marginalized.

1 Boumesbah Wasilla, *Op Cit* p 280.

2 Model Statute of the Opposition in Parliament, unanimously adopted by the participants in the Parliamentary Seminar on Relations Between Majority and Minority Parties in African Parliaments (Libreville, Gabon, 17–19 May 1999), available at: <http://archive.ipu.org/dem-f/opposition.pdf>

3. Rights Concerning Representation in Parliamentary Bodies

The 2020 Constitution emphasized the opposition's right to be represented within parliamentary structures such as permanent committees and the parliamentary bureau. Article 116 calls for "pluralistic representation," which, in theory, allows the opposition to take part in shaping internal parliamentary decisions. In reality, this representation often falls short. Internal parliamentary rules have not been sufficiently updated to reflect the constitutional provisions. The allocation of leadership roles in committees, for example, remains largely under the control of the majority¹. As a result, the opposition's presence within key decision structures tends to be formal rather than influential.

4. Additional Institutional Rights

Other rights granted to the opposition include referring matters to the Constitutional Court, participating in parliamentary diplomacy, and receiving public funding proportionate to their representation. These elements suggest an intent to give the opposition a more balanced and structured presence within the institutional landscape. Yet these rights come with conditions that limit their accessibility. In some cases, eligibility is restricted to officially recognized parliamentary groups, excluding independent members or emerging political forces². This reduces the inclusivity and impact of the rights on broader democratic representation. While the constitutional provisions appear to strengthen the status of the opposition, closer legal analysis reveals several shortcomings that undermine their practical significance:

1 Malati Maamar, op Cit p 488.

2 Idem , p 489.

Lack of Procedural Differentiation: The rights granted to the opposition are mostly general and do not offer procedural advantages that reflect its unique role. Legislative participation and oversight mechanisms are shared with all deputies, leaving little room for distinct privileges that could enhance the opposition's influence.

Regulatory Gaps in Internal Rules : Despite the constitutional changes, parliamentary rules of procedure have not been adequately revised. This lack of alignment creates a disconnect between the constitutional vision and day to day parliamentary operations. Without detailed implementing provisions, the constitutional guarantees remain theoretical¹.

Conditional Rights: Some rights, such as referring cases to the Constitutional Court, are subject to strict requirements, including a minimum number of deputies or affiliation with a recognized parliamentary group. These conditions can exclude independent or minority voices and limit the opposition's capacity to act autonomously.

Absence of Judicial Oversight: There is no dedicated judicial mechanism to challenge violations of opposition rights within Parliament. This absence leaves the opposition without recourse in cases of exclusion or procedural abuse, weakening the enforceability of its constitutional status².

Discrepancy between Principle and Practice: While the Constitution promotes a participatory and pluralistic role for the opposition, actual parliamentary dynamics remain dominated by the majority. This gap calls into question the sincerity of the

1 Benmalek, Bachir, *Parliamentary Oversight of Government Action in Light of the Algerian Constitutional Amendment of 2020: The Implementation of Laws as a Case Study*, Journal of Legal and Economic Studies, Vol. 5, No. 3, 19 June 2023, pp 23-24.

2 Ibidem, p 24.

constitutional reforms and the real commitment to democratic balance¹.

THE SECOND TOPIC

The Limits of Implementing Constitutional Recognition in Practice

While the Algerian Constitution formally recognizes the parliamentary opposition and grants it a defined set of rights, the actual functioning of Parliament continues to raise serious questions about the extent to which these rights are implemented and whether the opposition's role extends beyond symbolic acknowledgment. A clear gap persists between constitutional provisions and parliamentary practice, which calls for a closer examination of the legal and institutional challenges hindering effective implementation, as well as the practical shortcomings affecting the opposition's ability to carry out its functions

First Requirement:

Legal and Institutional Challenges Facing the Parliamentary Opposition in Algeria

Although Algeria's constitutional amendments of 2016 and 2020 marked a significant step in formally recognizing the parliamentary opposition as a core component of the legislative system, practical application has proven far more complex. The opposition continues to face a number of legal and institutional obstacles that weaken its effectiveness and limit its influence in legislative affairs. These difficulties contribute to a disconnect between constitutional theory and parliamentary practice,

1 Nassima Attar, *Development in Parliamentary Oversight of Government Work in Light of the 2020 Constitutional Amendment (Algeria)*, *Law & World* 31 (2024): 142.

making the opposition's role appear largely symbolic in many instances¹.

One of the primary legal challenges lies in the absence of detailed legislation and regulatory texts that give full effect to constitutional rights. The Constitution grants the opposition a range of participation in drafting legislation, overseeing government activity, and being represented in parliamentary structures. Yet these rights were not followed by organic laws or implementing regulations that clarify how they are to be exercised. Also, no specific law has been issued to define the conditions and procedures through which the opposition can, for example, hold leadership roles in committees or submit draft laws under special procedures². As a result, constitutional provisions remain declarative, lacking mechanisms for enforcement. This deficiency undermines the principle of legal hierarchy and coherence, which requires that constitutional norms be supported by lower level legislation to ensure their functionality. Without such implementation, these provisions are reduced to aspirations rather than guarantees³.

Another major limitation lies in the internal regulations of both parliamentary chambers, which have not been sufficiently revised to reflect the new constitutional status of the opposition. These internal rules continue to reinforce the dominance of the majority, allowing it to control key procedural aspects, such as the distribution of speaking time, the structure of debates, and the selection of committee leadership. Although Article 116 of

1 Nassima, Attar, op Cit , p143.

2 Bendjilali Abdel Rahman, *Constitutional Parliamentary Opposition Rights in the Fields of Legislation, Oversight, and Institutional Representation, A Study of the Algerian Constitution*, Annals of the University of Algiers 1, Issue 32, 2018, p. 68.

3 Idem, 69.

the 2020 Constitution calls for opposition representation in parliamentary bodies, internal rules remain vague on how this should occur¹. No criteria have been established regarding proportions, procedures, or the obligations of the majority to include minority voices. This results in procedural ambiguity that restricts the opposition's ability to engage fully and autonomously in parliamentary functions. The result is a form of institutional imbalance in which opposition groups are acknowledged in principle but excluded in practice, reducing their capacity to participate meaningfully in legislative processes.

The opposition currently lacks access to an independent mechanism within Parliament to safeguard its constitutional rights. In cases of exclusion, whether from committee leadership, legislative agendas, or debate time, there is no impartial body available to address grievances or ensure accountability. And the Constitutional Court, while a vital organ for legal oversight, is not authorized to intervene in procedural or organizational matters within Parliament. In parallel, disciplinary or administrative bodies within Parliament are generally controlled by the majority, which compromises their neutrality and effectiveness. Without avenues for redress, violations of the opposition's rights may go unchallenged, fostering a climate where constitutional provisions are routinely overlooked or selectively applied².

The final challenge stems from the prevailing political culture, where legislative activities are often shaped by executive influence and partisan control. In this environment,

1 Ibidem.

2 Fanni Mandak & Peter Smuk, 2012, *Institutionalization of Parliamentary Opposition – Comparative Analysis Of European Case Studies*, Paper prepared for the 22nd IPSA World Congress, Madrid, 8-12 July 2012.

the opposition's efforts are frequently dismissed as rhetorical gestures, with little influence over legislative outcomes or institutional direction. Parliamentary practice continues to be characterized by strong alignment between the executive branch and the ruling majority, leaving minimal room for independent initiatives or dissenting voices. The opposition, in this context, is seen not as a vital democratic actor but as a peripheral presence without real authority. This condition reflects not only a legal gap but also a lack of political will to transform Parliament into a space of pluralism and accountability. Without a genuine commitment to institutional reform, the opposition's constitutional status will remain largely theoretical¹.

Second Requirement:

Weak Practical Implementation of the Parliamentary Opposition's Rights

Although the Algerian Constitution affirms the rights and institutional status of the parliamentary opposition, parliamentary practice falls short of translating these gains into concrete realities. Many of the rights enshrined in legal texts, both constitutional and political, face real constraints that hinder their enforcement, reducing the opposition's role to a largely symbolic function rather than a source of effective institutional balance². Parliamentary experience shows that the opposition plays a limited role in the legislative process. Article 116 of the 2020 Constitution grants it the right to contribute to the preparation of legislation. But, in practice, the opposition is rarely empowered to submit draft bills or amend those proposed by the government or the ruling majority. Its initiatives are often rejected on procedural grounds or postponed indefinitely,

1 Fanni Mandak & Peter Smuk, op Cit.

2 Malati Maamar, op Cit p 490.

leading to a legislative process overwhelmingly controlled by the majority and marginalizing the constitutional promise of inclusive participation¹.

The same applies to the oversight function. Although oversight tools such as oral and written questions, motions of censure, and investigative committees are theoretically available, they are rarely effective in practice. Government responses to opposition inquiries are often vague, delayed, or ignored altogether. Motions of no confidence, while legally permissible, remain virtually impossible to initiate due to strict quorum requirements and political resistance within the legislature. These shortcomings are not only procedural but also reflect a lack of political culture that values genuine scrutiny and accountability. And in terms of parliamentary structures, the opposition's representation tends to be symbolic rather than meaningful². Even when opposition members are appointed to head certain committees, these positions are often limited to bodies with low political relevance or technical mandates. Key legislative or oversight committees continue to be dominated by the majority. Additionally, the opposition has little influence over the agenda or speaking time in plenary sessions, as such privileges are controlled by internal rules favoring the dominant political bloc.

A major institutional gap also lies in the lack of coordination between Parliament and other constitutional bodies. For instance, the opposition's right to refer matters to the Constitutional Court has yet to be fully operationalized. There are no effective mechanisms to connect the work of opposition

1 Ibidem, Article 116.

2 According to the Rules of Procedure of the Council of the Nation (2017), opposition representation within permanent committees is subject to the chamber's internal discretion, limiting its effective role. Official Gazette No. 49.

MPs with oversight institutions such as the Court of Accounts or anti-corruption agencies. This institutional isolation weakens the opposition's capacity to engage in broader political and legal processes that support transparency and accountability¹.

The broader political context further constrains the opposition's role. The Algerian political system continues to reflect executive dominance and weak parliamentary independence. Within this environment, the opposition remains on the defensive, with minimal capacity to initiate or influence legislative or institutional outcomes. Cultural attitudes toward political dissent reinforce this imbalance, as opposition is frequently perceived as obstructionist rather than as a legitimate contributor to the democratic process. The weakness of practical implementation, therefore, does not stem solely from legal shortcomings but from a combination of legislative gaps, institutional fragmentation, and a political environment that resists pluralism. These factors work together to marginalize the opposition, which exists in a constitutional framework but is largely excluded from meaningful participation in legislative governance².

A close legal reading of the constitutional and practical status of the parliamentary opposition reveals a significant disconnect between principle and application. Algeria stands out regionally for having constitutionally recognized the opposition as an institutional actor with defined rights, this recognition lacks enforceability, as opposition groups are denied access to the tools needed to exercise these rights independently and effectively³. Constitutional rights must be accompanied by procedural and institutional safeguards that translate legal theory

1 Ibidem.

2 Malati Maamar, op Cit p 491.

3 Idem, 492.

into actionable frameworks. Without such guarantees, rights lose their normative value and become symbolic inclusions rather than operational instruments. This is precisely the challenge in the Algerian context: the opposition is acknowledged in the constitutional text but not supported by mechanisms that allow it to influence lawmaking or oversee executive activity. And from a comparative constitutional perspective, one finds that in many established parliamentary systems, opposition parties are granted preferential procedural rights such as control over audit committees, dedicated questioning sessions, or priority for introducing legislation¹. In Algeria, by contrast, the opposition must operate under the same procedural rules as the majority, with no differentiated status or supportive framework that enables it to carry out its responsibilities²

Conclusion:

The analysis of the parliamentary opposition's position within the Algerian constitutional framework reveals that, although formally recognized, this status remains largely unfulfilled in practice. The 2020 Constitution and earlier versions marked a significant evolution in acknowledging the opposition's role and rights. Yet, this recognition has remained, in many respects, theoretical and disconnected from a legal and institutional system capable of ensuring its effective exercise.

A close reading of both the constitutional text and parliamentary practice highlights several obstacles that prevent the realization of meaningful institutional balance. Chief among these are the absence of complementary legislative instruments, the inadequacy of internal parliamentary rules, the lack of mechanisms to monitor the enforcement of opposition rights,

1 Bendjilali Abdel Rahman, op Cit p71

2 Ibidem.

and a broader political environment that continues to reinforce majority dominance at the expense of genuine pluralism.

Establishing a functional and empowered parliamentary opposition cannot be achieved solely through constitutional declarations. It requires genuine political will, detailed implementing legislation, and impartial institutions capable of enforcing fairness and equity within Parliament. The opposition should not be seen as a disruptive element, but rather as an essential partner in promoting transparency, accountability, and democratic vitality. Without enabling this role, Algeria's parliamentary democracy will remain a formal construct, lacking both substance and credibility.

Bibliography List setting

1. Academic References:

- Benmalek, Bachir, *Parliamentary Oversight of Government Action in Light of the Algerian Constitutional Amendment of 2020: The Implementation of Laws as a Case Study*, Journal of Legal and Economic Studies, Vol. 5, No. 3, 19 June 2023
- Bendjilali, A. R. (2018). *Constitutional Parliamentary Opposition Rights in the Fields of Legislation, Oversight, and Institutional Representation: A Study of the Algerian Constitution*, Annals of the University of Algiers 1, (32), 68.
- Boumesbah, W. (2019), *The Status of Parliamentary Opposition in Comparative Constitutions*, Journal of Political Science and Law, Arab Democratic Center, Berlin, 3(13), 276.
- Leclercq, C. (1999), *Constitutional Law and Political Institutions* (10th ed.). Litec, p. 126.

-
- Vidal-Naquet, A. (2009), *The Institutionalization of the Opposition: What Status? For What Opposition?*, French Review of Constitutional Law, 1(77), 159.
 - Maamar, M. (2018), *Parliamentary Opposition in the Algerian Constitution*, Journal of Legal and Political Sciences, (17), 487.
 - Fanni, M., & Smuk, P. (2012), *Institutionalization of Parliamentary Opposition – Comparative Analysis of European Case Studies*, Paper presented at the 22nd IPSA World Congress, Madrid, July 8–12, 2012.
 - Inter-Parliamentary Union. (1999), *Model Statute of the Opposition in Parliament . Adopted at the Parliamentary Seminar on Relations Between Majority and Minority Parties in African Parliaments* (Libreville, Gabon, 17–19 May 1999). Available at: <http://archive.ipu.org/dem-f/opposition.pdf>

2. Legal and Constitutional References:

- Algerian Constitution of 2016, Article 114.
- Algerian Constitution of 2020, Article 116.