Do Parliaments in the AI era Still Have Their Classic Role?

Marius Vacarelu
National School of Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest, Romania

marius333vacarelu@gmail.com

Abstract: For hundreds of years, parliaments have represented a pillar of democratic governance, and to a large extent, the history of many countries contains the efforts that societies have made to establish and make this type of representative institution viable. For these reasons, both legal and political literature in each country has been influenced by the relationship that the governmental environment had with the nation, through the intermediary of parliaments. Nevertheless, a consensus was established fairly easily at the scientific level, namely that each country needs such a form of representation of the main trends in society, and public struggle and pressure had to be directed towards convincing the decision-makers of past centuries of the necessity of establishing these parliaments. To make things even clearer, we note that as soon as a state proclaims its independence, a process of appointing authorities in the state follows, both executive and deliberative, the latter being called parliaments. After these national general deliberative assemblies were established, the process of adopting constitutions followed, and afterwards, states continued on their own path. This process developed over hundreds of years until the emergence of AI technologies, which brought several changes in human thinking as well as in the ways of creating and drafting the legal acts specific to parliaments. The changes that AI brings are being investigated in all spheres of science, and the legal-political space cannot be an exception to this broad process of investigating the consequences brought by new electronic technologies. Parliaments will not be exempt from confronting the effects of AI, although some political leaders will not want to acknowledge this. However, it is the duty of any jurist specializing in public law to try to analyse some of these transformations that will be impossible to avoid, because based on them, the traditional role of parliaments may also be called into question, at least in a significant part of it.

Keywords: Artificial intelligence, Parliaments, Changes, Citizens, Representation

1. Introduction

In the second half of the 2010s, applied discussions began regarding Artificial Intelligence (AI) and the changes it would bring to the public sphere. Political science specialists were among the most involved in these directions, as they primarily had electoral campaigns in mind (and the Cambridge Analytica scandal provided them with arguments (Information Commissioner's Office 2018) and the temptation of dictatorship in a handful of countries (Yang 2025). Professionals and researchers in the legal field were less involved, but even here there were certain distinctions, because the most interested were lawyers working in the commercial law sphere (lato sensu); specialists in the broad area of public law were the least interested (McGurk and Tomlinson 2025). This gap between branches of law is surprising, because public law is the law of governance, which means that ultimately any act of legislators ends up being applied and or supervised by means of this large part of the law, and what is determined to be a vulnerability of the state, economy and society must also be remedied by means of (the same) public law.

It is true that in our lives we regularly perform acts within the sphere of commercial law – and generally from the broad area of private law, as legislation statues – daily, and according to legal experts' estimates, these represent the big majority of our current activity. However, the great themes of life are usually fixed through acts from the sphere of public law, or through procedures in which public law participates (birth, marriage, death, the payment of direct and especially indirect taxes every day, participation in electoral processes etc). This means that, in reality, contact with public law is constant, but the average person does not identify very clearly how present law is in their life – implicitly, public law.

AI is not a new phenomenon; although the share this technology occupies in today's discussions and debates is that of an "established social institution". It emerged because of the development of digitalization. Therefore, its impact on legal systems is not new, as several concepts have emerged within legal science over the past two decades: E-Governance, E-Administration, E-Participation (public). However, these new concepts did not have the impact of AI, even though they foreshadowed part of the transformations brought about in the last five years (Zhang and Li 2025). Moreover, these concepts (e-something) are not analysed solely from a legal perspective, as other disciplines are also interested in analysing these new realities – notably administrative sciences and political sciences – inspiring numerous papers and conferences.

In the sphere of public law, however, there is a key point that largely determines what happens in all sectors of society, namely parliaments and their activity, and what happens to them in this new era of AI interests us all. Even if I do not have the space to write a treatise on this subject, and I must underline this very strongly: it is

necessary to point out the most important issues regarding the relationship between parliaments and AI, from the advantage point of the legal studies.

2. Why do Parliaments Exist?

Among the institutions that allow a country to have a vibrant political life, in which citizens feel represented – at least to a certain extent – the most important is the parliament, often referred to in legal doctrine as the "National Representation", because its principle of constitution is applied territorially to the entirety of a state (Burns and Kamali 2002). It is, in essence, an application of the general principles of political hierarchy, so that each sector of human activity is led or at least supervised from the level of the centre or capital, because each state has the legitimate claim to impose its will on every point of the national territory, implicitly creating institutions with identical territorial competence, with different roles, established by documents of major importance – as a rule, through constitutions.

In the public perception, the parliament is the place where a lot of talking happens, an impression reinforced by the fact that the etymology of the word comes from the French language, being in fact an extension of the verb "parler = to speak". Also, there are many criticisms levelled at members of parliaments for the income and benefits/privileges they have – which differ from country to country – relative to the general situation of ordinary people, and many of the reproaches are true. In addition, there is a problem regarding public perception – again, with much justification – concerning the legal and political accountability of parliamentarians, which is diffuse, and more than once almost absent, which can turn into a basis for activities at the limits of legality carried out by the respective individuals, who know their degree of immunity before the law, as it is most often constitutionally enshrined (Weinberg 2020).

As an institution with a fundamental role in any state – in essence, even dictatorships have a political body with a similar constitutional name and profile, even if the appointment of members is controlled and the real decision-making power is minimal – it is logical that the transformations brought by AI will also affect it. As the reality of life shows us day by day, nothing escapes untransformed by AI – or at least the relationship of AI with objects, public and social institutions, the economy, people, and so on, is something that will shape and define the coming decades. Yet, since the parliament officially plays the role of the institution that decides the content of the most important acts in terms of legal force, it is logical for AI to also calibrate itself in various forms, precisely as an effect of this interaction. There is an additional argument – the regulatory framework is what can ultimately establish which AI agents can operate in a country and at what parameters, an aspect that the parliament alone can determine, either directly, through a law it adopts, or through the approval of a decision previously adopted by the government (Bromo et al. 2026). Therefore, we find ourselves before the legal institutions – government and parliament – which can limit the use of AI through their own acts, and this prerogative belongs solely to them (obviously, if they can also succeed in implementing the decision, because countries with weak technologies are unable to act effectively in this matter).

3. The Traditional and the new Parliament

All over the world, parliaments try to be those institutions that play the leading role in a state (Seaward, 2003), and here we must make a brief analysis of their traditional role, to see if AI will threaten a part of this position acquired over time. To begin with, we will note the legislative attribute that parliaments have, and which has almost always represented their most important attribute. It is also the National Representation that appoints or dismisses governments, because the theory of the separation of powers in the state has established itself globally (Takata 2024), and the heads of state no longer have the role of confirming the government, because the cabinet is accountable to parliament, based on the investiture vote.

Another traditional role of parliaments was the judicial one, exercising this type of attributes under certain conditions for hundreds of years – and even if to a large extent this capacity has been greatly reduced, there still remained (rather it is a transformation) the possibility of initiating inquiry committees for various events of importance and gravity for a country (following wars or events that had either major human and material costs in society, or had a psychological impact in a country). This possibility – of establishing inquiry committees – is corroborated by the right they must be informed about any issue in society, the public administration having the legal obligation to make all relevant data available to parliament, because certain conclusions can be reached that can influence current or future legislative proposals (Betham 2006).

Another important role that parliament has in any country is that of appointing to certain administrative positions of importance (head of national television, head of national bank etc.), being therefore the institution that organizes both the selection of personnel, as well as the hearing and investiture.

We also note a certain separation between the role of parliaments in presidential or semi-presidential republics, relative to parliamentary republics. Thus, in a parliamentary republic the president of the country is elected by parliament (citizens therefore do not participate in this process), while in a presidential republic parliament plays the role of partner to the president, having under certain conditions the right to suspend and or dismiss them (if they have seriously violated certain constitutional norms).

Parliaments will be widely affected by the emergence – more precisely, the dominance – of AI, because they concentrate a large part of the political power in a country; no matter how dictatorial its regime is, there is a certain protocol for the members of the National Representation, and even at a formal level, certain procedures are maintained that formalize its presence in the national political game (Stapenhurst and von Trapp 2016).

It is mandatory to mention that, beyond this aspect of legality and democracy, the influence of AI on parliaments will be uneven at a global level, because economic conditions are also different, and here we will also have to add a certain perspective on ethics (UNDP 2025). This will be visible in terms of the draft laws that will be drafted by parliamentarians, and which will be influenced by the general attitude toward work ethics and plagiarism (Suvanto et al. 2026), as well as the economic power itself of the state and the political groups proposing the new legal norms. Thus, it will be cheaper (because experts will not be hired to contribute to the intellectual effort), and at the same time less open to criticism for some parliamentarians to draft bills almost entirely with AI tools in countries where the idea of ethics is laxer – whereas in places where moral principles are stronger such actions will be less encouraged (Kaczmarek et al. 2025).

It remains to be seen whether such an attitude – namely that of increasing the number of bills assisted/written with the help of AI – will not further diminish the prestige of parliaments in the eyes of voters, who may perhaps want electoral legislation amended and the number of parliamentarians reduced. The legitimacy of institutions is not something that lasts forever (Dervishi 2025), and shortcomings of any kind in the behaviour of their agents (both parliamentarians and staff working in the parliamentary apparatus) can diminish their prestige (the institutions') to the point where proposals emerge to eliminate them from the national constitutional system.

It is important to mention that there are major differences between what the activity of parliaments means, relative to the concepts of E-Governance, E-Administration, and E-Participation. The three dimensions are more specific to the executive branch and the relationship of citizens with the executive branch, and less to parliaments, which represent the legislative branch. Governance and public administration represent the everyday interface of states, whereas parliaments have different operating periods – including longer recesses – and have procedures that are not always bound by legal deadlines, which allows debates on certain topics to be extended for months or years. On the other hand, public administration and the executive branch are bound by deadlines and procedures that must be fulfilled as quickly as possible, which allows – or makes necessary – more digitization, and perhaps even more AI in their day-to-day activity (Fan 2025).

4. AI and Lawmaking: A Change of the Parliament Role

The most important change that AI will bring to the sphere of parliaments will be in the area of lawmaking. It is natural for this to be the case, because after the aspects related to leading the country in situations of political crisis, as well as appointing governments, parliaments are defined today by an entire set of procedures through which laws are adopted and enter into force. The prospects are quite clear, namely that AI will qualitatively change the lawmaking activity, through the prism of several factors, which will use the new electronic technology in their own interest (Inter-Parliamentary Union 2026).

The lawmaking process is based on two typologies. In the first case, the procedures belong to the parliamentarians, because they have the right of initiative regarding draft laws, and their vision is not the same as government has. The first aspect that parliamentarians must consider – and where they will use AI intensively – is the creation of the legal text, because based on it they will have to negotiate within their own party, as well as with other parliamentary groups.

The first problem that arises here is related to the studies that each member of parliament has: their competence to propose laws and to vote on them is complete, unlimited, but this does not mean that

whoever proposes a legal text is also a specialist in that respective field – unfortunately, in most of the world's constitutions, not even minimum educational requirements are provided for those running for parliaments. Far from being a simple or humorous issue, the intellectual competence of parliamentarians is a problem for any political party, which can see its polling numbers shattered by the sheer ignorance / evident incompetence of a single MP (Jokela et al. 2025). Furthermore, the complexity of today's world requires bills that are as balanced as possible and properly targeted at various business categories and professions, which is not easy to achieve, and in the absence of solid studies that enable a parliamentarian to understand the reports coming from the parliament's own staff, the bills they support can turn out to be very poor. It is precisely this awareness of their own incompetence that will provide additional arguments for using AI in drafting regulatory texts, and – to reiterate what was stated above – not all parliaments in the world are filled with the brightest minds, the most honest, the most financially disinterested, and so on. Therefore, in the absence of advanced skills for understanding regulatory and administrative texts, AI emerges as a genuine solution, transforming lawmaking into an analysis of multiple text variants generated by an AI provider.

Parliamentary regulations establish the ways in which legislative proposals follow specific steps – committee opinions, plenary procedures, votes, but they will never restrict how parliamentarians write these texts. Not even in the case of draft laws submitted to parliament as a citizens' initiative is there any limitation regarding the persons and means that will be consulted to write the text. Obviously, if there are no restrictions on the drafting of normative texts, there will be none for the analysis of the various materials placed on the parliamentarians' desks either, who, even if very honest and competent, might not otherwise have the time to process the information coming from all directions, and here AI summaries can be useful, though not completely, because the details are often what takes time to understand.

Will legislative proposals in the AI era therefore write themselves, in relation to the party doctrine, which will be provided to the AI agent? Or will the "brain" of the parliamentarian analyse the draft law, and correct, modify, or withdraw it? But, if we arrive at such a relationship where the "work" is done by AI agents, and parliamentarians will only be those who negotiate voting majorities or just correct parts of the text, without writing the text in its entirety, what will actually be the legitimacy of political parties and the parliament (Sanders and Scheier 2025)? The question arises and the answer that the political class will give will be particularly important, because citizens, seeing this, will certainly demand a reduction in the number of parliamentarians, as well as many of the assistants of those remaining. At the same time, it will be possible to discuss whether it would not be simpler for draft laws to be written with the help of AI by any interested person, and from there, be sent to the parliament, which would transform into a giant machine of analysis, negotiation, and voting? Is there, however, also another possibility, namely that citizens demand to have a more frequent role in adopting certain normative acts, through popular vote – most likely electronic?

In the second lawmaking typology, the government creates laws (propose the draft of new laws), and parliament must analyse and vote for or against. Here too, part of the human-AI relationship presented in the case of parliament applies, because governments also have a general legal scope of action, but they also face stricter deadlines than the National Representation. It is precisely the combination of deadlines and the large amounts of information to analyse before drafting a normative act that can be an incentive to use AI, and the only obstacle may be that of non-public data content that could end up in the ownership of the providers of this new technology.

But AI appears in a specific moment, too, namely in the operations of persuading parliamentarians to vote one way or another, including a vote against the government’s legal norms’ proposal. The online environment is active twenty-four hours a day, it is thus easier for those involved in various political campaigns to act primarily here, and less through street rallies (which cost more than paying for subscriptions to some AI providers. Therefore, campaigns to influence votes can be carried out more easily with the help of AI in the electronic environment, and parties and governments are sensitive to the various opinions that prevail – and which can be written in whole or in part with the help of AI – in the internet space; however, the number of likes on social networks does not always belong to real users, as the press in various countries sometimes reveals.

Thus, AI changes a few fundamental things regarding the traditional capacity of parliaments to be the central collective representative institution of a country (De Vrieze 2026). First, the premise we all understand is that parliamentarians are individuals elected on the lists of representative parties, and their contributions in parliament were human, assisted by their own staff of advisors, as well as by the party apparatus, to which information and people from various socio-economic-administrative bodies could be added, upon request.

This time, in the AI world, draft laws will be made entirely by an electronic provider, with human intervention occurring on this typology of will. From here, a question: if 50 parliamentarians ask for a draft law in a specific field, and do not formulate its objectives in detail, does it mean that each of them will get the same result, if they use the same AI provider? Even worse: if 5,000 citizens of a country seek to have their own draft law, just like the 50 parliamentarians above, and have the same general requirements, does it mean that the draft law for everyone will be identical? The sad answer is "yes", if the same AI provider is used. Where could differences between draft normative acts come from now on? First, if the AI providers are different, we have high chances of having differences – as reality and some studies show, there are differences in the approach to certain topics, both in terms of ideology and certain sensitive topics.

Can such a procedural change contribute to altering the legitimacy of parliaments? The answer is – undoubtedly – yes.

5. AI and the Growing Role of Parliament

In other spheres of action, however, the role of parliaments will increase, relative to the use of AI. This is based on a simple matter that we are all aware of: AI agents are trained to search large databases, and this is largely useful to both citizens and parliamentarians, in this E-Participation paradigm.

Specifically, I start with the activity of parliament appointing various individuals to positions of responsibility in the state. Here, the biggest problem is that of the CVs of the candidates for the positions in question, because any party will look for "stains" in their careers to eliminate them from the competition. Yet, in this sphere, AI agents can become very valuable collaborators, which is ultimately useful to everyone, as a CV with vulnerabilities will be even harder to hide, preventing future scandals and governmental crisis.

An extension of this data search capability on the part of AI agents will be the increased capacity of parliamentary inquiry committees to identify irregularities in the sphere of public administration activity. Again, the scheme of identifying facts is subordinated to party political interests – we cannot be naive to believe that these can be concealed – but what the administration could more easily hide from human investigations will be harder to cover up in front of AI databases. The big problem for those who will want to hide data from the demands of parliamentarians is that AI has a wider database than that of a specific institution, as well as methods for comparing/detecting fraud in the respective country, but also from other countries. Thus, what is recognized as a "probably incorrectly prepared administrative document" by AI tools can be based on a rarer casuistry in the country where the investigation is being conducted, but more present in other states, and the similarities of fraud thus cross borders and – very importantly – linguistic spaces. Thus, the translation capabilities of AI will be very good for increasing documentation regarding fraud of any type, and in the European Union – where there are several official languages, but also transnational normative acts – translation capabilities from language X can lead to the identification of administrative frauds committed in another country, which has an official language very different from X (Moneus and Sahari 2024). Not surprisingly, prosecutors will also benefit from these translation capabilities, which is not to the benefit of those who want to defraud public funds.

A specific note considers the use of AI by parliamentarians in their relationship with their own voters, but also in electoral competitions, for positive propaganda or against political opponents (OECD 2025). In any situation, objectivity shows us that this will perhaps be the most frequent role of AI, because the frequency of elections – every four or five years – forces many mid-level politicians to be in continuous political competition, through which they promote their messages in any possible social medium. Again, as I said at the beginning of this text, we do not have enough space to examine in detail the entire relationship between new AI technologies and political power, but we cannot fail to mention that the recent incidents recorded with AI agents – which acted outside the control of their creators – do not actually show a real perspective on the future of political competitions.

As a result of these transformations, parliamentarians will be somewhat more powerful – if we analyse the prospects of the inquiry committees, but in reality, more vulnerable, regarding how draft laws will be drawn up in the future. It will also be interesting to watch how political parties will adapt to these changes, because their ultimate goal is to obtain majorities in parliament and effective power, and not in public opinion or on social networks – an aspect that many politicians still do not fully realize.

6. Conclusions

Analyses regarding the role of parliaments in the 21st century are often fixed in the classical paradigm of the separation of powers in the state. This is, however, not always useful as the international political reality shows us. There are many countries where this separation is merely a declarative matter, written into constitutions, but in fact emptied of content. On the other hand, the prestige of deliberative institutions is declining worldwide, which helps neither the power relations between state institutions, nor the citizens, who want fewer empty words, but more effective rights, as well as recognition of real merits.

In this complex equation, AI has arrived with the force of thousands of libraries, offering data to better research the activities of public administration, but especially of public figures in the political sphere. As we have emphasized, however, the greatest impact of AI will be within the lawmaking process. The changes it brings – already visible in some countries, where the possibility of using it openly has begun to be recognized – will affect, however, not just the simple way of writing a legal text, but especially the perception of the parliamentary institution in front of the national electorate, which will certainly want humans to be at the centre of lawmaking, rather than a machine, and which will most likely end up demanding a reduction in the number of parliamentarians in every democratic country. Time will offer some solutions to this problem as well (that of lawmaking with the help of AI), but we are not so confident that, in the future, parliaments will still be able to maintain the same number of members they do currently.

Ethics Declaration: I declare that in this text the rules regarding academic ethics and integrity have not been violated.

Artificial Intelligence Declaration: I declare that Artificial Intelligence was not used in this text either for research or for the conception or writing of the text, with each sentence belonging entirely to me.

References

Betham, D. (2006) Parliament and Democracy in the Twenty-First Century: A Guide to Good Practice, Geneva: Inter-Parliamentary Union.

Bromo, F., Gambacciani, P. and Pinto, L. (2026) “AI tools in Parliament: Analytical framework and empirical insights”, in Parliamentary Affairs, gsag031, https://doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsag031.

Burns, T. & Kamali, M. (2002). The Evolution of Parliaments: A Comparative, Historical Perspective on Assemblies and Political Decision-making, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318445363_THE_EVOLUTION_OF_PARLIAMENTS_A_Comparative_Historical_Perspective_on_Assemblies_and_Political_Decision-making.

De Vrieze, F. (2026) “AI integration in lawmaking requires a parliamentary change process, not just a tech project”, [online], https://psaparliaments.org/2026/02/23/ai-integration-in-lawmaking-requires-a-parliamentary-change-process-not-just-a-tech-project/.

Dervishi, E. (2025) “The Role of Parliaments in Ensuring Effective Governance: What Went Wrong?” in Interdisciplinary Journal of Research and Development. 12. 200. 10.56345/ijrdv12n1s126.

Fan Y. (2025) “The role of artificial intelligence in the digital transformation of government: opportunities and ethical challenges”, in Front Public Health. 13:1694996. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2025.1694996.

Information Commissioner’s Office (2018). Investigation into the use of data analytics in political campaigns. A report to Parliament. https://ico.org.uk/media2/migrated/2260271/investigation-into-the-use-of-data-analytics-in-political-campaigns-final-20181105.pdf.

Inter-Parliamentary Union (2026), The role of AI in parliaments, https://www.ipu.org/ai-guidelines/role-ai-in-parliaments.

Jokela, M., Meriläinen, J., Tukiainen, J. and von Schoultz, Å. (2025) “Personality Traits and Cognitive Ability in Political Selection”, in Journal of the European Economic Association, Volume 23, Issue 5, Pages 1908–1949, https://doi.org/10.1093/jeea/jvaf010.

Kaczmarek, A., Żok, A. and Baum E. (2025) “Ethical principles across countries: does 'ethical' mean the same everywhere?”, in Front Public Health 13:1579778. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2025.1579778.

McGurk, B., Tomlinson, J. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and Public Law, Hart Publishing, 2025.

Moneus A.M. and Sahari Y. (2024) “Artificial intelligence and human translation: A contrastive study based on legal texts”, in Heliyon 14;10(6):e28106. doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e28106.

OECD (2025) Governing with Artificial Intelligence: The State of Play and Way Forward in Core Government Functions, Paris: OECD Publishing.

Sanders, N. and Schneier, B. (2025) “AI Will Write Complex Laws”, [online], https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/ai-will-write-complex-laws.

Seaward, P. (2003), “The History of Parliament. History Compass”, 1: **-**. https://doi.org/10.1111/1478-0542.009.

O’Brien, M., Stapenhurst, R. and von Trapp, L. (2016) Benchmarking and Self-Assessment for Parliaments (eds.), Washington D.C: International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Washington D.C.

Suvanto, M., McGlinchey, A., Barclay, P.J. and Wahde, M. (2026), "Detecting undisclosed LLM-generated content in parliamentary texts", https://arxiv.org/pdf/2606.14209.

Takata, H. (2024) 'Separation of powers in a globalized democratic society: Theorizing the human rights treaty organs' interactions with various state organs', Global Constitutionalism, 13(3), pp. 458–487. doi:10.1017/S2045381723000114.

UNDP (2025) "The Next Great Divergence: Why AI May Deepen Inequality Between Countries", https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2025-12/undp-rbap-the-next-great-divergence_1.pdf.

Weinberg, J. (2020) 'Why Do We Hate Politicians?', in Who Enters Politics and Why?: Basic Human Values in the UK Parliament. Bristol University Press, pp. 1–24.

Yang, Eddie. 2025. "The limits of AI for authoritarian control", in American Journal of Political Science 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.70045.

Zhang, Y. and Li, Y. (2025) "The impact of artificial intelligence on government digital service capacity", in International Review of Economics & Finance, Volume 102, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iref.2025.104374.