THE CONTRIBUTION OF REMITTANCES TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE CARIBBEAN

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION
FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN
Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean
CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT
AND COOPERATION COMMITTEE

GENERAL
LC/CAR/G.543
3 August 1998
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

THE CONTRIBUTION OF REMITTANCES TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE CARIBBEAN

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN
Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean
CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT AND COOPERATION COMMITTEE
Port-of-Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 1998

Preface

Migration has always formed an important part of population history in the Caribbean. The region has experienced various periods of immigration and emigration, as seen in the slave trade, indentured immigration, and various intra-regional and extra-regional movements. In the 1980's, for example, the Caribbean region lost approximately 1.350 million people through emigration.

The impact of migration on the development process of the Caribbean was one of the major concerns expressed at the Caribbean ICPD Follow-up Meeting, held in Bahamas, May 1995. The need was identified for a more in-depth assessment of the new directions, within the context of changing patterns and the new development paradigms and trading policies of the region. These are contained in the recommended goals and actions contained in the *Caribbean Plan of Action- Follow-up to ICPD* (otherwise known as the *Bahamas Consensus*).

This study, which seeks to clarify the close linkages between migration and social and economic development, represents a further step towards fulfilling the research and data needs required by governments for informed decision making. It is the first in a series of three studies aimed at assessing some of the migration-related problems facing the Caribbean region to-day. Funding was provided by the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), through the regional project CAR/97/P07, executed by the Demography Unit, ECLAC Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago.

Table of Contents

THE CONTRIBUTION OF REMITTANCES
TO SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN THE CARIBBEAN

Introduction

There have been several waves of migration throughout the history of the Caribbean. The earliest inhabitants migrated to avoid their enemies but present day migration is largely motivated by economic reasons. In recent times there have been three distinct periods of migration. In the 1930s, there was a wave of migration to Central America to work on the construction of the Panama Canal; the 1950s and 1960s saw a shift in the focus of migrant workers to the United Kingdom to work mainly as nurses and in public transportation; the most recent wave of migration has been directed to the United States and, to a lesser extent, Canada. While the waves of migration may have focused on a particular geographical area at a given time, smaller flows of migrants to other countries would have continued.

A logical consequence of the migration of workers is a reverse flow of remittances to support dependent relatives, repayment of loans, investment and other purposes. While it is usually asserted that migrant remittances have contributed in no small measure to the economic and social development of the Caribbean, much of the discussion is largely anecdotal. The accuracy of the estimates of migrant remittances is rather doubtful and very little empirical work has been done on the evaluation of contribution of remittances to economic development. Data on remittances are collected largely to estimate balance of payments flows and no attempt is usually made to relate such flows to income generation in the local economy. Thus, there is usually no distinction between current and capital remittances.

The analysis of remittances, in the absence of a theoretical framework which relates remittances to household optimization, saving and investment will not fully explain the flow of remittances or give guidance on the factors which would influence sustained inflows necessary for development. This paper would attempt to outline a framework for analysis of remittances and identify some of the variables which would determine sustained inflows for development purposes. The first section of the paper discusses the concept of remittances and examines the major factors which influence the level of remittances. The measurement of remittances is discussed in Section II and Section III provides some information on the order of the magnitude of remittance flows to selected Caribbean Countries. The contribution of remittances to development is the subject of Section IV and Section V identifies measures which would improve the level and consistency of remittances. The final section consist of some concluding remarks.

The Concept of Remittances

Remittances refer to transfers made from earnings or the accumulated stock of wealth by individual migrants to their country of origin. In can be viewed as a form of co-insurance payments which arises from an implicit contract between the individual migrant and his family. Resources are remitted for support of dependants, repayment of loans, investment or other purpose. Given that a typical sum is transferred with a set of instructions about its disposition between various uses, it is extremely difficult to apportion these amounts into current and capital transfers.

A useful taxonomy of remittances is provided in Wahba (1991) who divides remittances into four types:

1. Potential Remittances - savings available to the migrant once all expenses in the host country have been met. These represent the maximum the migrant can transfer at any time.

2. Fixed Remittances - the minimum the migrant needs to transfer in order to satisfy her family's basic needs and other contractual obligations.

3. Discretionary Remittances - transfers in excess of fixed remittances. These together with fixed remittances constitute the level of actual remittances.

4. Saved Remittances (or retained savings) - the difference between potential remittances and the amount remitted during the period. These flows are accumulated into a stock of resources which can be used to supplement actual remittances at a later date. This stock of wealth is a result of a portfolio decision by the emigrant and she may be encouraged to make these resources available for the development of her country of origin.

This classification is extremely important for the analysis of remittances and the resulting policy actions since the different components are driven by completely different motivations. Some further insights may be uncovered by pursuing the implications of this classification a little further.

The concept of potential remittances is pretty straightforward and need not attract further comment. Fixed remittances arise from the basic motivation for migration, such as diversification of sources of income, household size and other contractual obligations. These will be discussed in greater detail in the next section.

The flow of discretionary remittances, on the other hand, is determined by the relative attractiveness of maintaining a store of value either in the host country or the country of origin. The relative attractiveness depends on the differential between real interest rates in the two countries, expected movements in exchange rates, general macroeconomic stability, the ease of conversion of one currency into the next and the efficiency of the payments mechanisms (especially money transfer facilities) between the two countries. In particular, higher real rates of interest and stable exchange rates would be conducive to an increase in the flow of discretionary remittances.

Saved remittances are the other side of the coin to discretionary remittances. An increase in the level of discretionary remittances, other things equal, would reduce the flow of saved remittances and hence slow the rate of increase of the stock of retained earnings. It is this stock of wealth which has the greatest potential to assist in the development of the Caribbean countries if measures can be instituted to encourage the diaspora to maintain its stock of wealth or store of value in their country of origin.

Migration and Remittances

The issue of remittances arises only because there was a prior decision to migrate, thus the analysis of remittances cannot be divorced from an analysis of the factors which motivate migration. It is this analysis of migration which provides part of the rationale for fixed remittances. This brief section of the paper cannot do justice to the multi-faceted issue of migration and its motivating factors. Thus, rather than focus on the factors which determine migration for its own sake, this section of the document would examine the influence of the motivating factors on the decision to remit.

In spite of the voluminous literature on migration and the importance of remittances to many developing countries, there are very few attempts to develop a systematic theory of remittances. The seminal works of Lucas and Stark (1985) and Stark (1991) are notable exceptions. Lucas and Stark (1985) divide theories of remittances into three groups, i.e., Pure Altruism, Pure Self-interest and Tempered Altruism or Enlightened Self-Interest.

In the Pure Altruism model, the migrant derives utility from the utility of the rest of her household in the country of origin. The utility of the household depends on its per capita consumption. The migrant's utility function depends on her own consumption and on the weighted utility of the rest of the household in the country of origin. The migrant chooses the level of remittances which maximizes her utility function. This model yields two testable hypotheses: (a) remittances increase with the migrants wage level; and (b) remittances decrease with the level of income of the household (i.e. remittances to less well-off households would be higher). The impact of household size on the level of remittances can be either positive or negative depending on the presence of economies or diseconomies of scale in consumption, the rate of decline in marginal utility of home consumption and whether the migrant has a preference for a subset of the household in the home country.

Pure Self-interest generates three motives for remittances. The first arises from the belief that if she takes care of the family a larger portion of the family wealth would be bequeathed to her. This motive predicts larger remittances the larger the potential inheritance. The second motive is to build up assets at home such as land, houses and livestock, which would necessitate that family members act as agents to purchase the assets and maintain them in good condition. The third motive may arise from an intent to return home at a later stage which would require investment in fixed assets, in a business or in community projects if the migrant has political aspirations. The last objective illustrates the difficulty of separating altruistic and self-interest motives.

Neither of the two theories above is sufficient to explain the extent and variability of remittances. Thus Lucas and Stark developed a theory which views remittances as part of an inter-temporal, mutually beneficial contractual arrangement between the migrant and the household in the country of origin. Such contractual arrangements are based on investment and risk. In the case of investment the family bears the cost of educating the migrant worker who is expected to repay the investment in the form of remittances. This motive not only predicts that remittances could be higher for more educated workers but also that remittances from children of the head of the household would be higher than from in-laws and even spouses.

The risk motive gives rise to a much richer theoretical analysis which utilizes portfolio investment theory. In most developing countries both financial markets and insurance markets are not well developed. In addition, income, especially agricultural income is subject to a significant variability due to natural disasters, hurricanes, droughts, etc. In these circumstances the decision to migrate is a rational decision to reduce risk by diversifying the household's stock of human wealth over activity and space. Provided that the stocks which affect the host country and the country of origin are not highly correlated positively, it would be mutually beneficial for the migrant and her family to enter a co-insurance contract. The migrant would remit relatively more when the home country is beset by natural disasters and similarly the family would take care of her obligations at home or even make transfers to the migrant if she becomes temporarily unemployed.

Such contractual arrangements are voluntary and, hence, must be self-enforcing. The mechanism for self-enforcement could be mutual altruism which explains why such arrangements are usually struck between members of a household. The aspiration to inherit, the desire to return home and the need to have reliable agents to assist in the accumulation and maintenance of assets are additional considerations for self-enforcement.

A number of well documented observations abut migration and remittances can be explained by this theory of Enlightened Altruism. These include:

<u>The Structure and Performance of the Economy</u>

1. A high ratio of agriculture to GDP is associated with higher rates of migration. Agricultural income is more variable and hence the greater need for coinsurance;

2. The decline of an industry induces higher migration since income prospects in the home country would decline hence the need for spatial diversification;

3. Economic downturn in the host country reduces the flow of remittances (insurance payments), but this may be moderated by drawing down the stock of accumulated wealth;

4. Natural disasters in the country of origin induce a larger inflow of remittances. This is also predicted by pure altruism but enlightened self interest would predict that such flows will be higher for households with more assets;

Education

1. Migration would be higher among the more educated members of the household, not only would their job opportunities and income prospects be greater, they represent the stock of human capital which is part of the policy of diversification;

2. The level of remittances from the more educated is greater, not only because their earning would be higher but the remittances represent higher implicit loan repayments to the family which has invested in their education.

Other

1. Remittances are positively related to the size of the family at home;

2. Remittances are higher among the younger migrants because their income prospects are higher and have to repay the investment in their education;

3. Remittances decline with the duration of time abroad but would not cease, even if they are reunited with their immediate family in the host country, as long as there is an inheritance motive or a desire to return home;

4. Female migrants tend to remit more for care of the family, but males in families with assets would tend to remit more to maintain their favoured status in the line of inheritance.

Trends in Migration in the Caribbean

Recent trends in Caribbean migration have been reviewed in Guengant (1993) and Simmons and Guengant (1992). In his 1993 paper Guengant estimated that net migration from the Caribbean region amounted to 5.6 million during the period 1950 to 1990. This figure represents 16 per cent of the region's population in 1990 or 32 per cent of the 1950 population. Of this, 1.4 million occurred in the 1980s, slightly less than the 1.7 million net population loss in the 1970s.

Quite naturally the highest absolute loss of population occurred among the countries with the highest population. Jamaica and Haiti recorded losses in population of approximately one million each to top the region. Other countries which recorded significant losses were Puerto Rico (about 800,000), Cuba and the Dominican Republic (700,000 each) and Guyana and Trinidad and Tobago (300,000 each). However, some of the smaller Caribbean States experienced the highest rates of population losses. Dominica, Grenada, Saint Kitts-Nevis, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines experienced net migration losses equivalent to more that 80 per cent of their populations in 1950. For the CARICOM countries as a group, excluding the Bahamas, the weighted rate of migration loss was 62 per cent of their 1950 population, vastly exceeding the 32 per cent average for the wider Caribbean Region.

The major host nations for Caribbean migrants are the United States and Canada. The European countries also received significant amounts of Caribbean migrants. The United States and Canada were the recipients of 2.7 million legal immigrants from all of the Caribbean countries. This figure excludes the approximately 800,000 migrants from Puerto Rico who have moved to the United States. However in contrast to the United States and Canada, European migration was largely determined by colonial ties. Thus the United Kingdom received migrants from the English-speaking Caribbean, France from the Francophone Caribbean and the Netherlands from the Dutch-speaking countries.

Intra-Caribbean migration has been minuscule compared with the volume of extraregional migration. Simmons and Guengant (1992) estimated that in 1980 there were 307,000 intraregional migrants in the Caribbean amounting to approximately 1 per cent of the total Caribbean population and 7 per cent of the region's loss of population during the period 1950 to 1980. They further noted three features of the intraregional movement of people.

(a) The bulk of intraregional migrants originate in just a few countries. Some of these origin countries, such as Haiti, have very large base populations such that the outflow has had relatively little impact on the sending nation but major impacts on the receiving nations. Others, such as several small islands in the Eastern Caribbean, have small base populations such that the large outflow has had a major impact on them and an impact on the receiving countries in the region as well, since several of these tend also to be smaller countries.

(b) Migrant flows tend to be directed toward a few principal destination countries. The bulk of intraregional movers circa 1980 are found in the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Trinidad and Tobago, the United States Virgin Islands, the Bahamas, French Guyana and Guadeloupe.

(c) The migrants themselves have distinctive educational, income and occupational profiles which suggest they play unique roles in the in the economies of the destination countries.

According to Simmons and Guengant (1992), intra-Caribbean migrants hail principally from Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, Grenada and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. These account for slightly more than 60 per cent of all intra-Caribbean migrants, of which almost a third were born in Haiti. In absolute terms Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Cuba are significant contributors to intraregional migration, but because of their huge populations relative to the rest of the Caribbean, the proportion of migration relative to their total population is quite small. The authors estimate that only 2.3 per cent of the Haitian population are living in the region. By contrast the countries of Grenada and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines which are among the top five contributors to intraregional migration, approximately 21 per cent and 16 per cent, respectively, of their populations are resident in other Caribbean countries. These two Windward islands together with Saint Kitts-Nevis, the British Virgin Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands and Anguilla represent the countries which show a high propensity to migrate to other Caribbean countries, with the proportion of their migrants within the region as a percentage of total population exceeding 15 per cent.

Following are the major destinations for intra-Caribbean migration (see Table 2 extracted from Simmons and Guengant (1992)):

The Bahamas with its higher standard of living based on tourism and off-shore financial services has been a major destination for migrants from Jamaica, Haiti and the Turks and Caicos Islands.

Migration to Cuba occurred prior to the Second World War to assist in the harvesting of sugar cane and also for professional and business reasons. These migrants hailed mainly from Jamaica and Haiti. These migrants are now elderly and are rapidly dying off.

The Dominican Republic is an important destination for Haitian cane cutters.

Puerto Rico represents a major destination for migrants from the Dominican Republic and Cuba, where they work in industry and urban services.

In order to service its growing tourism industry and satisfy its demand for other professional and skilled workers, The United States Virgin Islands has absorbed significant numbers of migrants from the British Virgin Islands and other Eastern Caribbean countries (Anguilla, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica and Saint Lucia). It also hosts a small number of Puerto Rican nationals.

Barbados is a preferred destination for migrants from Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Saint Lucia but its position of host for a number of regional, educational and commercial institutions has also attracted migrants from other CARICOM countries.

The boom and bust of the petroleum sector in Trinidad and Tobago and its consequent impact on employment opportunities creates incentives and disincentives for the inflow migrants particularly from Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Guyana. Trinidad and Tobago is probably the only Caribbean country which has experienced a large overall net population loss to Europe and North America while at the same time absorbing significant numbers of migrants from other Caribbean countries.

Guadeloupe with its relatively strong economy attracts migrants from the other Departments in the French West Indies in addition to Dominica and Haiti.

Data on the occupational status of intra-Caribbean migrants is sparse, but in general they occupy lower rounds of socio-economic ladder in their host countries. They are usually engaged in low paying manual labor in the leading sectors of their host countries. There are very few intraregional migrants professional and managerial positions and even when they are they usually command salaries which are less remunerative than residents of the host countries.

There is significant diversity between Caribbean countries in terms of the preferred destination for their migrants. Jamaica, Suriname and Barbados tend to migrate extra-regionally. For example, of Jamaica's net migration representing 35 per cent of its 1980 population only about 2 per cent of the net loss migrated to Caribbean destinations. On the contrary, Grenada, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines which have also experienced significant net migration, about 25 to 45 per cent of their net migration has been within the Caribbean. A similar pattern is observed for other OECS countries excluding Montserrat.

Several of the countries which have small intraregional migration relative to total migration have strong links to 'mother' countries. For example Puerto Rico (United States) Guadeloupe (France) and Suriname (Netherlands). Other countries such as Barbados, Guyana, Trinidad and Jamaica have well developed educational systems which allowed them greater initial access to Europe and North America. This allowed them to build up kinship networks at an earlier stage than the other countries. The countries which have relatively more migrants in other Caribbean countries are the less developed countries with the least connection to patrons in the developed countries.

The Measurement of Remittances

The measurement of remittances is extremely imprecise and the flows of the major items have to be estimated in most cases. To further compound matters, the coverage of these items is much less than 100 per cent since a significant amount of these flows occur through unofficial channels and go largely unrecorded. Remittances is usually measured by the estimate of private transfers in the Balance of Payments. According to the International Monetary Fund Balance of Payment Manual, three categories of international transactions are included under this heading:

(i) Migrant Transfers: This records the flow of goods and the changes in financial items which arises from migration of individuals from one economy to another. These include all household and personal effects, together with any movable capital goods which are actually transferred from the economy which the migrant is leaving to the one she is going. Enterprises in which the migrant retains ownership after their departure and claims on other residents in the former economy are also included. In the case of the Caribbean this item records transactions mainly associated with returning migrants.

(ii) Workers Remittances: This component covers unrequited transfers by migrants employed in their new economy for a period exceeding one year. It does not include persons who work in the new economy for less than one year.

(iii) Other Private Remittances: This component covers transfers in cash or kind between individuals, between non-official organizations, and between an individual and a non-official organization. Such transfers include gifts, inheritances, alimony and other support remittances, non-contractual pensions from non-governmental organizations, compensation for damages; etc[1].

One item which is usually regarded as part of remittances associated with migration which is not recorded under private remittances is non-contractual pensions from foreign governments. This is usually recorded under Other Official Unrequited Transfers. This component has not been included in remittances in this paper because the data did not allow such a disaggregation except for Barbados.

Sources of Data

The data on remittances were obtained from the published Balance of Payments for the Caribbean Countries. In the case of the Eastern Caribbean Central Bank (ECCB) member countries, the data were taken from the ECCB Balance of Payments 1995 and Barbados' data were taken from Barbados Balance of Payments 1994. Data for all of the other countries except the British Virgin Islands were taken from the Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook 1994, of the International Monetary Fund. In the case of the British Virgin Islands data were provided by the Ministry of Finance.

All of the Caribbean countries use the IMF Balance of Payments manual to compile their Balance of Payments and consequently the estimate of private remittances. The actual estimation of remittances differs from country to country depending on the peculiarities of the local situation. In the ECCB area, data for the estimation of remittances in the balance

---

[1] Net claim receipts by residents from foreign insurance companies or their agents following disasters are also included.

of payments is gathered from a variety of sources.

Cash Remittances

(I) Commercial Banks record their purchases and sales of foreign currency on forms EC-0 and EC-1. Transactors are required to state the purpose of their purchases and the origin of their sales of foreign currency. These forms are analyzed for the computation of the Balance of Payments.

(ii) Balance of Payments Survey (BOP) Forms are sent out to various institutions annually and they are requested to provide information on a variety of foreign transactions including some of those recorded under remittances. The data from the BOP survey forms are used to compile the Balance of Payments.

(iii) Post Office Money Orders are also analysed for origin and purpose in order to compile the Balance of Payments.

Remittances in Kind

(I) The value of barrels and parcels passing through the Customs Department is included in the figure for remittances.

(ii) Similarly, the value parcels received through the Post Office is also included.

(iii) The Balance of Payments Survey Forms mentioned above also request information on transfers in kind.

The coverage of the transactions is far from complete since many of the transactions do not go through the official channels and would not be captured in the methods identified above. For example transfers of cash which are sent through the mail or with a friend or relative may not be recorded. Some of it may be captured by the commercial bank's EC forms but given the widespread use of US dollars for domestic transactions in the ECCB area this is not a certainty. In the case of the British Virgin Islands which uses US dollars as the medium of exchange these flows would most likely not be recorded. Thus recorded remittances are likely to be an understatement of actual remittances.

Whether the worker remits through official channels depends on a number of factors. These include:

(I) The efficiency of the money transfer mechanisms: The introduction of Western Union now makes it less costly, safer and more convenient to remit funds from the United States to the Caribbean and it is most likely to result in an increase in recorded remittances. The coverage would be increased as more people shift from unofficial means to official means of transfer.

(ii) The exchange control regime: A more liberal exchange control regime would reduce the incentive to hoard foreign exchange and more will pass through the official channels.

(iii) The stability of the exchange rate and the existence of parallel foreign exchange markets: The existence of parallel foreign exchange markets creates incentives for people to use unofficial channels since more local currency would be received for any given amount of foreign currency. The greater the difference between the official and parallel rates, the greater the incentive to avoid official channels. The instability of the exchange rate provides an incentive to hoard foreign exchange and avoid the official channels.

Developments in the three areas discussed above could result in the appearance that actual remittances are increasing when they may in fact be at the same level or even decreasing. For example the elimination of parallel currency markets means that most of the flows would go through the official channels increasing recorded remittances but the level of actual remittances may have fallen because of recession in the developed countries. The uncertainty of coverage of the transactions which constitute remittances in addition to the usual errors of measurement and categorization suggests that the data should only be used as indicative of the magnitude of flows of remittances. Moreover, given the importance of remittances to some Caribbean countries and the potential importance for all of the countries consequent on the levels of net migration indicated in Section II and the potential financial flows they represent, countries should endeavour to improve the measurement of these flows.

The Magnitude of Remittances

Data on the magnitude of flows of remittances to selected Caribbean countries between 1985 and 1994 are reported in Tables 3 - 6. The general direction of flows of remittances accords with the theory of remittances developed in Section I and data on net migration discussed in Section II. However, the magnitude of the flows does not accord with the phenomenal amount of migration which has been experienced in the last 30 years. This would suggest some under-recording or that Caribbean people are less likely to remit than their counterparts in other countries. There is some anecdotal evidence which suggests that this is not the case.

Table 3 provides information on the absolute value of net remittances for 16 Caribbean countries. The table focuses on net remittances, the difference between inflows and outflows, for two reasons. Firstly, it is easier to relate net inflows to the discussion on net migration in Section II and secondly it is net value of remittances which is the measure of the injection of these flows into the economy. Data on the breakdown of inflows and outflows are provided in the appendix.

Given the size of its population and absolute amount of net migration over the last 40 years (700,000 up to 1990) it is not surprising that the Dominican Republic has the highest level of remittances peaking at US$361 million in 1993. Similarly, Jamaica which is among the leading countries in the region in terms of net migration peaked at US$306 million in 1993. These flows seem to have increased rapidly since liberalization of the exchange control regime which suggest that more remittances are flowing through the official channels.

Four countries recorded negative flows, viz. The Bahamas, the British Virgin Islands, Suriname and Trinidad and Tobago. The Bahamas case accords with the discussion on the magnitude of migration flows, since it is not included in the countries which have experienced significant net out-migration but have been the recipients of significant amounts of migration from the rest of the region. The other countries have recorded significant amounts of out-migration but the inflows seem to be small relative to their populations living abroad. For example Trinidad and Tobago lost about 300,000 compared with its receipt of about 47,000 migrants from the Caribbean yet inflows are minuscule compared with outflows. Similarly for the British Virgin Islands and Suriname. This seems to suggest that countries are able to record outflows of remittances more efficiently than inflows. In fact there would be a natural tendency to do this, given the tighter exchange controls on outgoing flows and the fact that authorities tend to pay more attention to items which can have a negative impact on the balance of payments. In the cases of Guyana and Suriname the existence of a parallel foreign exchange market for most of the period would have reduced recorded inflows.

For the other countries the direction of the remittances seems to accord with the level of net migration experienced. One observation which would be returned to later is the apparent variability of the flows. This is consistent with the theoretical proposition that remittances would vary with the developments in the country of origin and the performance of the host country. The OECS countries which were hit by Hurricane Hugo recorded increased flows in 1989 and most countries showed a slowdown in the growth of remittances during the recession in the United States during 1990 to 1993.

Table 4 provides information on the ratio of remittances to the nominal Gross Domestic Product (GDP) at market prices for the Caribbean countries. Among the countries with positive net remittances, the contribution of remittances to economic activity is highest in Montserrat. Except for the statistical blip in 1989 associated with Hurricane Hugo, remittances represented between 15 and 20 per cent of GDP up to 1991 and then fall off to the level of most of the other OECS countries thereafter. For the other OECS countries except Antigua and Barbuda and the British Virgin Islands net remittances averaged between 6 to 9 per cent of GDP. From the discussion in Section II, these countries have experienced high levels of net migration, thus this observation is not surprising. In the case of Antigua and Barbuda remittances inflows are consistent with the other OECS countries but their level of outflows is also higher given that in recent years they have been the recipient of significant migratory flows from Dominica and the Dominican Republic.

Three of the countries (The Bahamas, Trinidad and Tobago and Suriname) which have negative flows of remittances have ratios of less that one per cent of GDP but in the case of the British Virgin Islands the net outflows represent about 8 per cent of GDP. As noted earlier, although the British Virgin Islands is host to significant quantities of workers mainly from the other OECS countries, significant amounts of migrants from this country are also abroad, but the coverage of these inflows may be less than required.

A pattern similar to that observed for the ratio of remittances to GDP emerges in Tables 5 and 6 which report on the ratios of remittances to exports of goods and services and to merchandise trade. Table 5 indicates that the OECS countries, except Antigua and Barbuda, the British Virgin Islands and Saint Lucia have the highest ratios. In Montserrat the ratio peaked at 194 percent in 1989 and averaged over 50 per cent up to 1991 and declined thereafter. The Dominican Republic also has a high ratio (averaging about 18 per cent) given its lower ratio of trade to GDP. In Table 6 which shows the ratio of net remittances to merchandise trade, the percentages become extremely exaggerated for the tourist oriented economies. Given the high contribution of services in overall trade, the ratios seem to explode, particularly for Montserrat, Anguilla and the British Virgin Islands. All three economies have net remittances to merchandise exports averaging in excess of 100 per cent. Similar but less spectacular increases are observed for Barbados, Jamaica, Grenada and Saint Kitts/Nevis.

The Contribution of Remittances to Development

The contribution of remittances to economic and social development depends on the uses to which the remittances are put. If the resources are used for conspicuous consumption there is very little contribution to economic development and given the high import content in the consumption pattern of the Caribbean countries, the impact on the balance of payments can be negative. On the other hand, if the resources are used for investment and essential consumption to improve the health and productivity of the society, the development of the society may be enhanced. There are several ways in which remittances may contribute to the development of Caribbean economies both directly and indirectly. Some of these are discussed in this section of the paper.

The inflow of remittances can be viewed as an injection into a Keynesian type circular flow of income. Injections into the circular flow increases economic activity by increasing the level of aggregate expenditure, while withdrawals from the circular flow reduce economic activity. Outflows of remittances are withdrawals from the circular flow and hence reduces economic activity. Thus it is the net remittances which measure the effect on the level of real economic activity. Other things equal, positive net remittances increase real economic activity while negative net remittances have the opposite effect. However, economic development goes beyond increases in real economic activity related to injections into the economy. Economic development requires that the economy be transformed to permanently increase its capacity to produce real output. In addition this should be supplemented by more equitable distribution of income and greater diversification of the economy. This would result in an improvement of the quality of life of the members of the society. Improvement in the quality of life results from:

(I) Increased consumption of goods (both public and private);

(ii) Improvement in employment opportunities; and

(iii) Improvements in the physical and social environment.

The most direct way in which remittances contribute to economic and social development is the improvement in the living standards of the recipient. As discussed in Section I, the decision to migrate may be a conscious choice to improve the income prospects of the household and to reduce risk associated with income instability. To the extent that this decision is successful, remittances would improve the living standard of the household enabling a higher level of consumption and increased educational opportunities for the rest of the household.

Consumption by itself is not a productive activity. However, to the extent that increased consumption by poor households improves their productivity by improving health or improves the capacity of young children in these households to learn and hence acquire a better education it may contribute to development. On the contrary, conspicuous consumption results in a depletion of the foreign exchange which came into the country when the funds are initially remitted. Remittances in kind which are in the nature of conspicuous consumption goods can also have a negative effect to the extent that it creates an imitative demand by other members of the society for these goods and a complementary demand by the receiving households for imported goods which are used jointly with the initial gift.

The improvement in educational opportunities for the rest of the household is beneficial both to the household and the country since this would create better job opportunities for the individual, and the country gets a more productive worker. One drawback is that with an existing kinship link in the developed country the likelihood that the more educated members of the household would also migrate is even greater. However, this may create a second generation flow of remittances in later years.

A logical consequence of the flow of remittances to poor households is the improvement in the distribution of income in the society, if as the theory predicts remittances would be higher for poorer households. Moreover, such resources can be invested in education and business to improve the income prospects of the household even further.

While the debate on the effect of migration and remittances on the distribution is far from settled in the literature, a number of studies internationally point to the favorable effects of remittances on the distribution of income (see Stark et al, 1988). Improvements in the distribution of income not only increase the welfare of the individual but have externalities which increase the social development of the society.

The investment of remittances in new businesses or into the expansion of existing family businesses is one of the ways that these flows contribute to economic development. These remittances need not be in the form of cash but may be in the form of capital goods, inventory or raw material. For many low income households access to credit is effectively closed, since formal credit markets do not recognize human wealth as collateral. Thus, the flow of remittances may be the only source of finance for investment in small businesses.

While the contribution of remittances to investment in new businesses is pretty straightforward in terms of the concept, the contribution to investment in existing family businesses has three aspects. The first can be related to inheritance motive, desire to return home for a comfortable retirement, altruism or profit motive. To satisfy these motives, resources in cash or kind is remitted to be invested in the family business.

The second aspect is related to the co-insurance that the 'contract' with the migrant provides to his family. It allows the household to undertake risky investments, for example in the improvement in agricultural practices, which would not have been undertaken if the household depended solely on the farm income. These investments would be undertaken with the knowledge that if the venture went sour or the pay-back period was longer than expected there would be income support from the migrant.

Assistance in disaster recovery provides a third aspect of remittances being invested in the family business. Although this is related to the co-insurance contract discussed in the preceding paragraph, the distinction here is that resources actually flow to assist in the rehabilitation of the business whereas resources need not flow in the second aspect. The security provided by the contract results in behavior modification which leads to economic expansion.

Not all households are entrepreneurial by nature, but if a proportion of remittances is saved, it provides a pool of investible resources which the less risk averse members of the society can use to develop the economy. Remittances in kind can contribute indirectly to the pool of savings if their consumption permits a higher level of saving by the receiving households. To contribute to development in this way, remittances must supplement domestic saving. It is quite possible that remittances can replace domestic saving by permitting a higher level of consumption. Because the flow remittances relaxes the households liquidity constraint there is usually a strong temptation to undertake higher levels of consumption than is necessary.

At the level of the economy the flow of remittances eases the balance of payments constraints by either providing foreign exchange directly in the case of cash or by reducing the demand for imported goods where remittances are in kind. The caveat here is the demonstration effect on the consumption of the rest of the society associated with the receipt of such goods. As reported in Section III, both the absolute level of remittances and the ratios relative to export earnings are quite significant to a number of Caribbean countries. Such flows gives the economy command over real foreign resources which can be used in the development effort.

The foreign exchange provided by flow of cash remittances (or saved by remittances in kind) permits the importation of capital goods and raw material necessary for economic development. None of the Caribbean countries have well developed capital goods sectors, thus most capital goods have to be imported. Similarly much of the raw material for industry and tourism have to be imported. The flow of remittances can play a critical role in the development process since the finance of expansion purely from domestic resources would run into the foreign exchange constraint.

While the flow of remittances back to the Caribbean contributes to the development of these countries in a narrow sense, a wider interpretation of the role of migrant resources in the development process would include migrant investment in activities for expansion of the exports of the Caribbean in the host country. Such activities would include facilities for the distribution of Caribbean goods and, restaurants which use Caribbean products, the promotion of tourism and cultural services. This wider interpretation is posited by Henry (1990) who views the utilization of all migrant resources whether at home or in the host country as a potential contribution to economic development.

Measures to Improve the Flow of Remittances

Any discussion on measures to improve the flow of remittances must take cognizance of the distinction between the various types of remittances discussed in Section I. There is not a lot that policy makers can do about fixed remittances as these are related to motives and contractual obligations which are outside the control of the authorities. The same is not true for discretionary remittances which are associated with the level of saved remittances. These two magnitudes are related to portfolio choices made by the migrant concerning the diversification of her wealth. Thus, measures aimed at influencing the flow of remittances must be aimed at influencing the factors which affect the portfolio choices of the migrant.

The breakdown of remittances given in the appendix seems to suggest that the flows of remittances have been largely current flows and little capital flows. This may be a bit misleading. While in principle it is possible to separate out the major types of remittances, in practice it is extremely difficult. A typical sum of money may be remitted with the following instructions: From this $500, one hundred for my insurance, $50 to pay my Friendly Society book for the next six months, $200 for the mortgage, $100 for my account at NCB, $20 for grand father's birthday and the rest just in case Junior needs anything urgently. The multiplicity of purposes (gift, saving, investment and precautionary) means that categorization of any observed figure is almost impossible. Fortunately it is not necessary to be able to categorize the flows, all that is required is that some aspect of the flows respond to the measures.

For these flows to play a significant role in the development process they have to be systematic, predictable and consistent. Policy makers and business would need to be able to plan for these with some degree of predictability or they would continue to play a marginal role. The variability of net remittances can be observed in Table 3 and is consistent with the literature. The measures to increase the flow of remittances must also try to address the variability. It is recognized that some amount of variability is associated with co-insurance and altruistic considerations but the portfolio choice considerations of discretionary remittances would react fairly predictably to the underlying variables. Some of these measures are discussed in the following paragraphs.

The flow of both fixed and discretionary remittances can be increased by improvements in the money transfer mechanisms. The efficiency of the money transfer mechanisms is related to the cost of transfers, certainty of transfers and the speed. Bascom (1990) outlines a number of problems with the existing money transfer services including the high costs, fraud, theft, timeliness, language difficulties and inconvenience. He recommends improved regulation of money transfer agencies and provision of additional services by the Post Office.

The portfolio choice of the migrant worker, like any investor, is based on risk and return. One determinant of the return is the rate of interest she receives on her funds. In order to attract more of the migrants' saved remittances, financial institutions in the Caribbean will have to offer more attractive rates of interest. If the rate of interest is less than the inflation rate the real return on remitted funds will be negative and there will be no incentive for additional funds to flow in. Not only must real interest rates be positive they must also be comparable to real rates in the host country of the migrant in order to influence his portfolio choice. Bascom (1990) notes that for much of the 1970s and 1980s the real interest rates in the Caribbean have been negative. The abatement of inflation in the countries with fixed exchange rates in the 1990s and the liberalization of interest rates in Guyana and Jamaica have resulted in mildly positive real interest rates. In particular the liberalization of interest rates in Jamaica along with the liberalization of exchange controls have resulted in a significant inflow of remittances and other capital inflows.

A second determinant of the return on investment is taxes on investment income. The portfolio choice is made on after-tax return, thus even if the real rate of interest is higher, taxes on investment income reduce the after-tax returns. While most Caribbean countries exempt investment income from government securities from tax, the same is not true for investment in private sector securities and/or interest earned in commercial banks. Governments may want to consider favorable tax treatment for migrant investment in securities and offer the same tax treatment offered to foreign investors for certain classes of investment.

The establishment of branches of regional financial institutions in the host countries can provide a way of tapping into the resources of migrants. Branches of commercial banks and insurance companies are avenues for reaching the lower income, less sophisticated members of the migrant population. Familiar institutions with good track records will help to engender the confidence of the usually suspicious migrant worker. Life insurance companies are remarkably efficient at mobilizing the resources of small savers. The crafting of creative investment instruments by the commercial banks could also assist in the mobilization of savings. The savings mobilized by branches of financial institutions can be brought back to the Caribbean to assist in the development process. However, although the resources mobilized by the financial intermediaries would have been part of the saved remittances of the migrant worker, they would not be reflected in the recorded remittances but rather as capital movements by the financial institutions.

The development of investment vehicles to mobilize the saved remittances of the more sophisticated migrant investors would be an additional mechanism to increase these flows. Such vehicles can either allow for the direct investment in the shares of Caribbean companies or be investment vehicles developed by financial intermediaries which lend to productive enterprises. The Chaconia Fund launched by the Republic Bank of Trinidad and Tobago in the United States is one such vehicle. Similar to the movement of funds by financial intermediaries such movement of funds would not be classified as remittances but rather as capital movements.

The launching of investment vehicles in the United States market is a very costly exercise and is subject to the regulatory oversight of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). Even though regulatory changes in the United States have made it easier for foreign private issuers to place their securities in the United States market it is still very difficult and expensive. Moreover, the enormous amounts of funds being managed by mutual fund, pension funds and insurance companies have resulted in institutionalization, globalization and international diversification of investments in the financial centers of the developed world. In an attempt to raise expected returns and reduce overall risk, these entities began making investments in emerging capital markets. Since the total assets of these institutional investors are so large even a tiny portfolio shift represents significant inflows to the receiving countries. Thus the development of efficient domestic money and capital markets is required to attract significant amounts of portfolio investment through which international capital now moves. The development of efficient money and capital markets would also give the migrant sufficient flexibility to move funds around.

Risk is the second concern of the investor and for the migrant it manifests itself in the form of currency risk and high inflation. Currency risks arise from exchange rate movements between the local currency and the currency of the host country. For floating currencies the risk of currency depreciation is ever present and for the fixed exchange rate countries currency devaluation is always lurking in the background. While there exists a number of short-term measures for hedging currency risks, they add to the cost of investing in the home country and these costs will have to be deducted from the return. The number of vehicles for long-run hedges are far fewer and are only as good as the financial strength of the institutions which provide them. A more attractive alternative would be for governments and domestic financial institutions to issue instruments denominated in United States dollars. These were quite popular until the Mexican crisis when the Government found itself with billions of Pesos of debt denominated in United States dollars whose value in terms of the Peso had increased exponentially with the devaluation of the currency.

Although inflation risk is not quite as visible a currency risk it is just as real. High inflation can erode the purchasing power of money as certainly as currency devaluation. Thus low inflation as well as stable exchange rates are required if the investor is to view the local currency as an equally good or a better store of value than the foreign currency. As long as the migrant views the local currency as an inferior store of value, the kind of remittance flows required for real economic development will not materialize. Low inflation and stable exchange rates can only be achieved in a stable macroeconomic environment. Credible macro policy is required to ensure that the money supply remains under control and preempt the emergence of an overhang of domestic currency. Fiscal policy must be tight, budget deficits must be under control and, where they arise, should be financed by borrowing from the public and financial institutions other than the Central Bank. A pre-commitment to a stable exchange rate regime may provide a credible anchor for these policies.

The major aim of macroeconomic policy would be to ensure that the domestic currency is at least as good a store of value as the foreign currency, by avoiding inflation and devaluation. If the foreign currency is seen as a better store of value, there would be very little inflow of discretionary remittances. However, all this would be in vain if people cannot easily convert from domestic to foreign currency. This would require the elimination of exchange controls, foreign exchange taxes and a reduction of the spread the foreign exchange dealers charge. The free convertibility of currency is particularly important to allow the investor flexibility to move his funds out without delay if it becomes necessary to do so. This may increase the inherent volatility of these funds but as long as macroeconomic fundamentals are maintained and credible macroeconomic policies are pursued the funds would be quite stable.

Conclusion

This paper looks at the contribution of remittances to social and economic development in the Caribbean. It discusses various types of remittances with a view to develop a set of policy measures for affecting the level of remittances. The decision to remit is based on a prior decision to migrate, hence the paper discusses the relationship between migration and remittances and briefly reviews the main trends in Caribbean migration. This serves as a backdrop for the analysis of the data on remittances which is provided for 18 Caribbean countries for the period 1985 to 1994.

The data reveal that in general the remittance flows accord qualitatively with the migration flows experienced by most of the Caribbean countries. However, the level of remittances appear to be low given the magnitude of net migration experienced by the countries. The recorded flows exhibit some level of variability which could be related to errors of measurement resulting from the coverage of the transactions which are classified as remittances. Based on the ratio of net remittances to GDP and to exports, remittances play a very significant role in the level of economic activity in the countries which have experienced high net migration, especially the Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Haiti and the OECS countries (except the British Virgin Islands and Antigua and Barbuda).

Notwithstanding the importance of remittances to some of the countries, the contribution of remittances can be improved by increasing the flow and consistency of remittances. Some of the ways in which remittances can contribute to the level of economic and social development are discussed and measures to improve the flow of remittances are identified. These include: improving the money transfer services; offering higher real interest rates, favourable tax treatment for investment by migrants, providing better vehicles for migrant investment in their home country and reducing exchange rate and inflation risks.

The saved remittances of migrants represent a potential pool of funds which can be mobilized for the development of Caribbean countries. The countries need to develop creative ways to utilize both the financial and human resources of the diaspora. Our understanding of what motivates the portfolio choices of Caribbean migrants is extremely limited and the analysis is hindered by the paucity of information on the flow of remittances. Countries may need to systematically improve the volume and accuracy of the information available to undertake the analysis which would inform policy action in this area.

Annex

This annex provides information on the following:

(i) Inflows (credit), Outflows (debit) and the balance (net) of remittances to and from selected Caribbean countries.

(ii) A breakdown according to the major categories of remittances.

References

Bascom, W., (1990), Remittances Inflows and economic development in Selected Anglophone Caribbean Countries, Working Paper No. 58 of the Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development, Washington D. C.

Central Bank of Barbados, Barbados Balance of Payments 1994, Barbados.

Eastern Caribbean Central Bank, Balance of Payments, 1995, Saint Kitts.

Guengant, J., (1993) "Wither The Caribbean Exodus ?: Prospects for the 1990's", International Journal, Vol. XLVIII, Spring, pp. 336 - 353.

Henry, R., (1990) A Reinterpretation of Labour Services of the Commonwealth Caribbean, Working Paper No. 61 of the Commission for the Study of International Migration and Cooperative Economic Development, Washington D. C.

International Monetary Fund, Balance of Payments Compilation Guide, Washington D. C. 1995.

International Monetary Fund, Balance of Payment Statistics Yearbook , Washington D.C., Various Issues.

Lucas, R. E., and O. Stark, (1985) "Motivations to Remit: Evidence from Botswana", Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 93, No. 5, pp. 901 - 918.

Stark, O., (1991), "Migration in LDC's: Risk, Remittances, and the Family", Finance and Development, Vol. 28, No. 4, December, pp. 41 - 44.

Stark, O., J. E. Taylor and S. Yitzhaki, (1988), "Migration, Remittances, and Inequality: A Sensitivity Analysis Using the Extended Gini Index", Journal of Development Economics, Vol. 28, pp. 309 - 322.

Simmons, A. B., and J. Guengant, (1992), " Recent Migration Within the Caribbean: Migrant Origins, Destinations and Economic Roles" The Peopling of the Americas, Veracruz, pp. 419 - 441.

Wahba, S., (1991), "What Determines Workers Remittances ?" Finance and development, Vol. 28, No. 4, December, pp. 41 - 44.

Table 1 - Migration Balances, Caribbean Countries, 1950-89

Country	Migration balances (000s) 1950-59	1960-69	1970-79	1980-89	Total 1950-89
Cuba	-10.0	-475.0	-222.6	-19.9	-727.5
Dominican Republic	-54.0	-175.0	-220.0	-240.0	-689.0
Haiti	-70.0	-220.0	-350.0	-400.0	-1040.0
Peurto Rico	-469.8	-211.9	-41.1	-110.1	-832.9
Jamaica	-165.1	-289.5	-270.8	-246.5	-971.9
Trinidad & Tobago	-0.4	-110.1	-94.7	-75.0	-280.2
Barbados	-20.2	-38.2	-14.7	-10.7	-83.8
Guyana	-4.3	-53.1	-129.5	-121.6	-308.5
Grenada	-12.4	-18.5	-21.4	-19.5	-71.8
St. Vincent & the Grenadines	-9.3	-20.0	-15.1	-13.1	-57.5
St. Lucia	-13.4	-17.8	-18.5	-13.0	-62.7
Dominica	-5.5	-9.7	-12.5	-15.8	-43.5
Antigua & Barbuda	-2.7	-5.0	-7.1	-7.1	-21.9
St. Kitts-Nevis	-6.1	-16.9	-8.0	-7.4	-38.4
Montserrat	-4.5	-2.6	-0.8	-1.6	-9.5
Belize	-0.8	-7.1	-19.5	-14.7	-42.1
The Bahamas	13.6	23.9	3.9	7.4	48.8
Bermuda	0.0	0.0	-2.3	-1.1	-3.4
U.S. Virgin Islands	-1.0	26.5	1.8	-13.1	14.2
Curacao	-4.5	-18.3	-16.9	-20.4	-60.1
Aruba	-13.0	-9.9	-5.5	-5.6	-34.0
Suriname	-4.4	-27.8	-97.6	-33.5	-163.3
Guadeloupe	-3.4	-25.3	-50.3	-14.0	-65.0
Martinique	-4.5	-30.9	-46.5	-4.3	-86.2
French Guyana	2.5	8.2	7.9	25.7	44.3
Caribbean Islands	-856.2	-1644.2	-1413.1	-1202.8	-5116.3
CARICOM Countries	-231.1	-564.6	-608.7	-538.6	-1943.0
Caribbean Region	-863.2	-1724.0	-1651.8	-1346.9	-5585.9

Source: Guengant (1993)

Table 2

Principal Destination Countries By Country of Origin for Within Region Migrants

Origin Country (Place of Birth)	Total from Origin who are living elsewhere in region	Percent Living in Principal Destinations: Primary Destination Place	Primary Destination Percent	Secondary Destination Place	Secondary Destination Percent	Cumulative Percent Primary & Secondary Destination
Haiti	103,080	Dom Rep	58.4	Cuba	21.9	80.3
Dominican republic	30,542	P. Rico	67.3	Haiti	19.1	86.4
Cuba	28,698	P. Rico	79.5	Haiti	8.5	88.0
Grenada	22,960	Trinidad	92.4	Barbados	2.2	94.6
St. Vincent	18,761	Trinidad	72.8	Barbados	17.9	90.7
Guyana	13,175	Suriname	49.1	Trinidad	22.1	71.2
Jamaica	12,924	Cuba	48.4	Bahamas	19.9	68.3
St. Lucia	12,419	Barbados	26.7	US Virgin	21.8	48.6
St. Kitts-Nevis	9,743	US Virgin	67.0	St. Maarten	11.4	78.4
Martinique	8,394	Guadeloupe	55.3	Fr Guiana	44.6	99.9
Dominica	8,238	Guadeloupe	47.7	US Virgin	32.2	79.9
Trinidad & Tobago	6,522	US Virgin	41.2	Barbados	23.3	64.5
Antigua	6,519	US Virgin	75.8	Br Virgin	6.0	81.8
Puerto Rico	6,256	US Virgin	79.8	Dom Rep	19.8	99.6
Barbados	5,933	Trinidad	67.3	Guyana	8.9	76.2
Suriname	5,251	Fr Guiana	57.5	Curacao	28.2	85.7
Curacao	4,492	Aruba	48.9	Bonaire	26.1	75.0
Guadeloupe	3,668	Martinique	67.6	Fr Guiana	29.7	97.3
Aruba	3,624	Curacao	56.3	St. Maarten	34.8	91.1
British Virgin Islands	3,438	US Virgin	96.3	St. Kitts	3.0	99.4
Turks and Caicos	2,695	Bahamas	99.8	Cayman	0.2	100.0
Anguilla	2,467	US Virgin	49.0	St. Maarten	30.4	79.4
French Guiana	1,637	Martinique	64.3	Guadeloupe	30.9	95.2
US Virgin Islands	1,225	P. Rico	83.4	Br Virgin	16.4	99.8
Montserrat	1,201	US Virgin	58.7	St. Kitts	22.8	81.5
Bahamas	453	Haiti	86.3	Cayman	11.0	97.4
Belize	137	Cayman	79.6	Bahamas	20.4	100.0
Bermuda	28	Bahamas	89.3	Cayman	10.7	100.0
Cayman Islands	26	Belize	53.8	Bahamas	46.2	100.0

Source: Simmons and Guengant (1992)

TABLE 3
NET REMITTANES FOR SELECTED CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES (Millions of US Dollars)

COUNTRY	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Anguilla	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.89	0.52	0.93	1.18	1.28
Antigua & Barbuda	NA	8.05	7.61	7.60	15.25	12.27	5.05	2.34	0.65	3.55
British Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	-11.12	-14.01	-13.26	-13.22	-18.54	NA
Dominica	NA	1.17	7.65	8.96	10.10	9.95	10.77	11.09	12.36	9.71
Grenada	NA	8.07	13.04	15.33	15.89	17.00	18.36	18.24	17.27	23.89
Montserrat	NA	7.84	8.63	9.26	32.39	14.10	7.90	7.36	5.33	5.57
St. Kitts/Nevis	NA	8.52	9.64	10.84	13.93	10.41	10.77	11.37	10.92	14.11
St. Lucia	NA	12.00	16.86	10.00	10.29	11.10	15.75	11.60	4.60	13.36
St. Vincent/Grenadines	NA	9.81	8.64	8.51	10.14	12.16	10.29	9.19	9.06	13.44
OECS						74.86	66.15	58.89	42.82	84.91
The Bahamas	-14.60	-14.10	-17.80	-28.90	-17.90	-10.60	-7.80	-12.80	-12.60	NA
Barbados	18.85	23.85	26.35	34.15	35.20	39.25	34.15	41.25	26.15	NA
Belize	19.00	15.40	17.90	23.10	20.70	16.30	15.40	17.70	15.40	14.50
Guyana	11.00	9.80	10.90	12.80	14.00	13.00	12.70	14.00	14.90	NA
Jamaica	153.20	111.60	117.20	135.60	135.20	155.40	153.30	248.20	306.40	NA
Suriname	-3.90	-1.90	-0.40	-4.60	-5.70	-7.50	-7.40	-7.30	NA	NA
Trinidad & Tobago	-35.00	-30.80	-20.20	-23.00	-19.00	-21.00	-15.90	-15.70	-6.70	NA
The Dominican Republic	NA	225.40	273.10	288.80	300.50	314.80	329.50	346.60	361.80	NA
Haiti	48.10	52.00	56.30	63.40	59.30	61.00	69.50	70.00	73.40	42.90

Source: ECCB Balance of Payments 1995
Central Bank of Barbados, Balance of Payments of Barbados 1994
IMF Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook, 1994
Bank of Jamaica

TABLE 4
NET REMITTANES FOR SELECTED CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES (Percentage of GDP)

COUNTRY	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Anguilla	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.6	1.0	1.6	1.8	1.8
Antigua & Barbuda	NA	3.9	3.2	2.7	4.8	3.1	1.2	0.5	0.1	0.7
British Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	-7.1	-8.3	-7.6	-7.4	-10.0	NA
Dominica	NA	1.0	6.1	6.2	6.6	6.0	5.9	5.7	6.1	4.6
Grenada	NA	6.2	8.7	9.2	8.7	7.7	7.6	7.3	6.7	8.8
Montserrat	NA	22.4	22.7	21.5	68.3	20.8	14.0	12.9	8.9	8.7
St. Kitts/Nevis	NA	8.3	8.7	8.9	10.7	6.8	6.8	6.5	5.7	6.8
St. Lucia	NA	5.4	7.0	3.7	3.4	2.8	3.7	2.4	0.9	2.6
St. Vincent/Grenadines	NA	7.7	6.1	5.3	5.8	6.2	4.9	4.0	3.8	5.6
The Bahamas	-0.8	-0.7	-0.8	-1.1	-0.6	-0.3	-0.3	-0.4	-0.4	NA
Barbados	1.6	1.8	1.8	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.0	2.6	1.6	NA
Belize	9.1	6.8	6.5	7.3	5.7	4.6	3.6	3.7	2.9	2.6
Guyana	2.4	1.9	3.2	3.1	3.7	3.3	3.6	-3.7	3.3	NA
Jamaica	9.1	5.5	4.6	4.5	4.0	4.8	6.1	12.9	10.5	16.2
Suriname	-0.4	-0.2	-0.0	-0.4	-0.4	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	0.0	NA
Trinidad & Tobago	-0.5	-0.6	-0.4	-0.5	-0.4	-0.4	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	NA
The Dominican Republic	NA	4.4	6.9	6.5	4.5	5.5	4.2	3.9	3.8	NA
Haiti	2.4	2.3	2.8	3.2	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.3	1.0

Source: ECCB Balance of Payments 1995
Central Bank of Barbados, Balance of Payments of Barbados 1994
IMF Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook, 1994
Bank of Jamaica
IMF International Financial Statistics, Various Issues

TABLE 5
NET REMITTANCES AS A RATIO OF EXPORT OF GOODS AND SERVICES FOR SELECTED CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

COUNTRY	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Anguilla	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.3	2.3	5.2	4.9	4.3
Antigua & Barbuda	NA	3.9	3.3	2.8	5.2	3.4	1.3	0.6	0.1	0.8
British Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	-6.4	-7.3	-7.6	-6.6	-5.9	NA
Dominica	NA	2.0	11.4	11.4	14.0	11.0	11.4	9.7	9.0	8.5
Grenada	NA	10.6	16.2	17.7	18.5	18.1	18.5	18.2	15.5	18.5
Montserrat	NA	59.9	54.5	54.6	193.6	73.4	39.3	33.4	20.3	18.2
St. Kitts/Nevis	NA	14.7	13.9	14.4	17.6	12.6	11.1	10.1	9.4	11.7
St. Lucia	NA	7.2	9.3	4.1	4.1	3.9	5.5	3.6	1.4	3.9
St. Vincent/Grenadines	NA	10.5	9.5	6.8	8.8	9.3	9.0	7.1	8.4	16.1
The Bahamas	-0.5	-0.7	-0.9	-1.5	-0.7	-0.4	-0.4	-0.6	-0.6	NA
Barbados	2.3	3.1	3.7	4.2	3.8	4.4	4.0	4.9	2.9	NA
Belize	18.7	12.2	10.7	11.8	9.5	7.1	6.1	6.2	5.1	NA
Guyana	5.2	4.3	4.0	5.4	6.1	4.8	4.8	3.7	3.6	NA
Jamaica	13.1	8.4	7.7	8.1	7.2	7.0	9.3	11.2	13.4	NA
Suriname	-1.1	-0.6	-0.1	-1.2	-1.0	-1.5	-2.0	-2.0	0.0	NA
Trinidad & Tobago	-1.5	-1.9	-1.2	-1.3	-1.0	-0.9	-0.7	-0.7	-0.4	NA
The Dominican Republic	NA	17.2	23.2	16.6	14.5	21.2	17.7	18.0	16.6	NA
Haiti	8.9	11.1	9.8	12.5	13.8	12.1	9.4	20.6	15.2	7.1

Source: ECCB Balance of Payments 1995
Central Bank of Barbados, Balance of Payments of Barbados 1994
IMF Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook, 1994
Bank of Jamaica

TABLE 6
NET REMITTANCES AS A RATIO OF MERCHANDISE EXPORTS FOR SELECTED CARIBBEAN COUNTRIES

COUNTRY	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994
Anguilla	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	510.0	117.5	157.5	109.7	78.1
Antigua & Barbuda	NA	41.1	45.2	44.7	97.1	36.7	10.2	3.6	1.0	8.0
British Virgin Islands	NA	NA	NA	NA	-117.8	-126.6	-102.0	-87.0	-103.2	NA
Dominica	NA	2.6	15.5	15.7	21.8	17.7	19.4	20.3	26.2	22.4
Grenada	NA	28.1	40.9	46.8	52.4	61.0	73.7	84.7	80.3	100.2
Montserrat	NA	347.0	245.3	403.2	2572.4	951.5	767.6	465.3	235.0	191.5
St. Kitts/Nevis	NA	33.9	34.4	39.5	48.7	37.7	38.6	35.2	34.9	50.7
St. Lucia	NA	14.5	21.2	8.4	9.2	8.7	14.3	9.4	3.8	14.1
St. Vincent/Grenadines	NA	15.4	16.7	10.0	13.6	14.7	15.3	11.4	15.9	31.2
The Bahamas	-1.0	-1.6	-2.2	-4.1	-1.6	-0.8	-1.0	-1.7	-1.8	NA
Barbados	6.2	9.7	19.9	23.4	23.8	25.8	23.6	26.0	17.1	NA
Belize	21.2	16.6	17.4	19.9	16.6	14.2	12.2	12.5	11.7	10.1
Guyana	6.7	4.4	4.1	5.6	6.2	5.0	5.1	4.8	3.6	0.0
Jamaica	27.2	19.0	16.6	15.4	13.5	13.4	14.2	23.6	29.0	NA
Suriname	-1.2	-0.6	-0.1	-1.1	-1.1	-1.6	NA	NA	NA	NA
Trinidad & Tobago	-1.6	-2.2	-1.4	-1.6	-1.2	-1.0	-0.8	-0.8	-0.4	NA
The Dominican Republic	NA	31.2	38.4	32.5	32.5	42.9	50.1	61.6	70.7	NA
Haiti	28.6	28.2	26.4	35.4	41.2	38.5	31.7	42.5	32.3	23.1

Source: ECCB Balance of Payments 1995
Central Bank of Barbados, Balance of Payments of Barbados 1994
IMF Balance of Payments Statistics Yearbook, 1994
Bank of Jamaica

TABLE 7 - BALANCE OF PAYMENTS 1990 - 1994
PRIVATE TRANSFERS

	1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993			1994		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
ANGUILLA																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:													17	11.9	5.1	16.9	15.49	1.41	19.74	17.22	2.52	23.84	20.66	3.18	24.54	21.09	3.45
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS													8.5	9.52	-1.02	8.45	12.98	-4.53	9.87	14.53	-4.66	11.94	17.16	-5.22	12.28	17.55	-5.27
a. Workers Remittances													8.5	9.52	-1.02	8.45	10.05	-1.6	9.87	10.78	-0.91	11.91	14.02	-2.11	12.26	14.16	-1.9
b. Other Transfers																	2.93	-2.93		3.75	-3.75	0.03	3.14	-3.11	0.02	3.39	-3.37
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS													8.5	2.38	6.12	8.45	2.51	5.94	9.87	2.69	7.18	11.9	3.5	8.4	12.26	3.54	8.72
i. Migrants' Transfers													8.5	2.38	6.12	8.45	2.51	5.94	9.87	2.69	7.18	11.9	3.5	8.4	12.26	3.54	8.72
ii. Other																											
ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	30.2	8.46	21.74	31.71	11.17	20.54	33.31	12.8	20.51	52.57	11.4	41.17	45.66	12.54	33.12	32.83	19.2	13.63	29.3	22.99	6.31	31.4	29.65	1.75	32.26	22.67	9.59
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	22.65	8.46	14.19	23.78	11,17	12.61	24.98	12.8	12.18	43.66	11.4	32.26	37.2	12.54	24.66	24.6	19.2	5.4	21.97	22.99	-1.02	21.4	29.65	-8.25	23.26	22.67	0.59
a. Workers Remittances	22.65	4.6	18.05	23.78	6.9	16.88	24.98	8	16.98	26.72	11.4	15.32	25.38	12.54	12.84	24.6	15	9.6	21.97	16	5.97	21.4	16.4	5	22	16	6
b. Other Transfers		3.86	-3.86		4.27	-4.27		4.8	-4.8	16.94		16.94	11.82		11.82		4.2	-4.2		6.99	-6.99		13.25	-13.25	1.26	6.67	-5.41
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	7.55		7.55	7.93		7.93	8.33		8.33	8.91		8.91	8.46		8.46	8.23		8.23	7.33		7.33	10		10	9		9
i. Migrants' Transfers	7.55		7.55	7.93		7.93	8.33		8.33	8.91		8.91	8.46		8.46	8.23		8.23	7.33		7.33	10		10	9		9
ii. Other																											
DOMINICA																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	19	15.84	3.16	30	9.34	20.66	31.7	7.51	24.19	35.71	8.45	27.26	38.21	11.35	26.86	38.53	9.45	29.08	37.55	7.6	29.95	40.97	7.61	33.36	39.11	12.88	26.23
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	11.4	4.94	6.46	24	4.94	19.06	24.7	3.51	21.19	26.71	4	22.71	27.03	7.43	19.6	26.22	5.24	20.98	24.24	3.6	20.64	29.85	3.61	26.24	31.11	12.38	18.73
a. Workers Remittances	11.4		11.4	24		24	24.7		24.7	25		25	25.25		25.25	22.43		22.43	22.19		22.19	25.88		25.88	27.8	0.2	27.6
b. Other Transfers		4.94	-4.94		4.94	-4.94		3.51	-3.51	1.71	4	-2.29	1.78	7.43	-5.65	3.79	5.24	-1.45	2.05	3.6	-1.55	3.97	3.61	0.36	3.31	12.18	-8.87
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	7.6	10.9	-3.3	6	4.4	1.6	7	4	3	9	4.45	4.55	11.18	3.92	7.26	12.31	4.21	8.1	13.31	4	9.31	11.12	4	7.12	8	0.5	7.5
i. Migrants' Transfers	7.6	10.9	-3.3	6	4.4	1.6	7	4	3	9	4.45	4.55	11.18	3.92	7.26	12.31	4.21	8.1	13.31	4	9.31	11.12	4	7.12	8	0.5	7.5
ii. Other																											
GRENADA																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	45	23.2	21.8	59.8	24.6	35.2	62.8	21.4	41.4	45.1	2.2	42.9	49.3	3.4	45.9	52.69	2.72	49.97	52.96	3.72	49.24	50.34	3.72	46.62	72.63	8.12	64.51
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	22.5		22.5	29.9		29.9	31.4		31.4	22.55		22.55	27.64		27.64	30.55		30.55	29.96		29.96	28.28		28.28	38.71	4.4	34.31
a. Workers Remittances	22.5		22.5	29.9		29.9	31.4		31.4	22.55		22.55	26.64		26.64	29.42		29.42	28.94		28.94	27.3		27.3	36.5		36.5
b. Other Transfers													1		1	1.13		1.13	1.02		1.02	0.98		0.98	2.21	4.4	-2.19
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	22.5	23.2	-0.7	29.9	24.6	5.3	31.4	21.4	10	22.55	2.2	20.35	21.66	3.4	18.26	22.14	2.72	19.42	23	3.72	19.28	22.06	3.72	18.34	33.92	3.72	30.2
i. Migrants' Transfers	22.5	18.6	3.9	29.9	19.7	10.2	31.4	20	11.4	22.55		22.55	21.66	3.4	18.26	22.14	2.72	19.42	23	3.72	19.28	22.06	3.72	18.34	33.92	3.72	30.2
ii. Other		4.6	-4.6		4.9	-4.9		1.4	-1.4		2.2	-2.2															
MONTSERRAT																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	24.67	3.5	21.17	27.3	4	23.3	29	4	25	95	7.5445	87.456	49	10.944	38.057	30.72	9.383	21.337	28.27	8.397	19.873	24.6	10.217	14.384	24.47	9.4367	15.033
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	24.67	3.5	21.17	27.3	4	23.3	29	4	25	95	7.5445	87.456	49	10.944	38.057	30.72	9.383	21.337	28.27	8.397	19.873	24.6	10.217	14.384	24.47	9.4367	15.033
a. Workers Remittances	24.67	3.5	21.17	27.3	4	23.3	29	4	25	95	4	91	49	7	42	30.72	5	25.72	28.27	3.95	24.32	24.6	4.06	20.54	24	3.521	20.479
b. Other Transfers				...							3.5445	-3.545		3.9435	-3.944		4.383	-4.383		4.447	-4.447		6.1565	-6.157	0.47	5.9157	-5.446
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS																											
i. Migrants' Transfers																											
ii. Other																											

TABLE 7 CONT'D

ST KITTS-NEVIS																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	28	5	23	31.33	5.3	26.03	34.68	5.4	29.28	52.08	14.476	37.605	51.47	23.355	28.115	40.23	11.153	29.077	39.82	9.1232	30.697	40.83	11.339	29.491	43.488	5.3847	38.103
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	25.2	4.5	20.7	28.21	4.77	23.44	31.24	4.86	26.38	46.942	13.926	33.017	46.323	21.674	24.649	36.207	11.153	25.054	35.838	8.6752	27.163	36.747	10.812	25.935	38.123	4.6035	33.519
a. Workers Remittances	25.2	4.5	20.7	27	4.77	22.23	28.8	4.86	23.94	46.242	11.655	34.587	46.323	16.81	29.513	36.207	6.66	29.547	35.838	4.48	31.358	36.747	4.743	32.004	38	2.5	35.5
b. Other Transfers				1.21		1.21	2.44		2.44	0.7	2.2705	-1.571		4.864	-4.864		4.4926	-4.493		4.1952	-4.195		6.0686	-6.069	0.1227	2.1035	-1.981
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	2.8	0.5	2.3	3.12	0.53	2.59	3.44	0.54	2.9	5.138	0.55	4.588	5.147	1.681	3.466	4.023		4.023	3.982	0.448	3.534	4.083	0.527	3.556	5.3654	0.7812	4.5842
i. Migrants' Transfers	2.8	0.5	2.3	3.12	0.53	2.59	3.44	0.54	2.9	5.138	0.55	4.588	5.147	1.681	3.466	4.023		4.023	3.982	0.448	3.534	4.083	0.527	3.556	5.3654	0.7812	4.5842
ii. Other																											
ST LUCIA																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	47.6	10.165	37.435	53.7	8.17	45.53	38.2	11.21	26.99	36.9	9.12	27.78	41	11.039	29.961	46.7	4.1705	42.53	48.382	17.065	31.317	40.87	28.443	12.428	55.235	19.17	36.065
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	42.84	10.165	32.675	48.33	8.17	40.16	34.38	11.21	23.17	33.21	9.12	24.09	36.9	11.039	25.861	42.03	4.1705	37.86	43.544	16.565	26.979	36.783	27.532	9.2515	50.227	18.148	32.08
a. Workers Remittances	42.84		42.84	48.33		48.33	34.38		34.38	33.21		33.21	36.9		36.9	42.03		42.03	43.544	4.5	39.044	36.783	8.199	28.584	37.814	5	32.814
b. Other Transfers		10.165	-10.17		8.17	-8.17		11.21	-11.21		9.12	-9.12		11.039	-11.04		4.1705	-4.171		12.065	-12.07		19.333	-19.33	12.413	13.148	-0.734
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	4.76		4.76	5.37		5.37	3.82		3.82	3.69		3.69	4.1		4.1	4.67		4.67	4.8382	0.5	4.3382	4.087	0.911	3.176	5.0078	1.022	3.9858
i. Migrants' Transfers	4.76		4.76	5.37		5.37	3.82		3.82	3.69		3.69	4.1		4.1	4.67		4.67	4.8382	0.5	4.3382	4.087	0.911	3.176	5.0078	1.022	3.9858
ii. Other																											
ST VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	35	8.515	26.485	37.2	13.865	23.335	37	14.02	22.98	39	11.63	27.37	41.7	8.865	32.835	41.16	13.393	27.767	41.584	16.78	24.804	43.6	19.13	24.47	52.14	15.86	36.28
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	31.5	8.015	23.485	33.48	13.001	20.479	33.3	9.72	23.58	35.1	7.73	27.37	37.53	8.235	29.295	37.044	12.723	24.321	37.426	16.11	21.316	39.24	18.33	20.91	47.14	14.86	32.28
a. Workers Remittances	31.5	4.5	27	33.48	7.776	25.704	33.3	6.3	27	35.1	4.5	30.6	37.53	5.67	31.86	37.044	6.0291	31.015	37.426	6.03	31.396	39.24	7.2	32.04	45	9	36
b. Other Transfers		3.515	-3.515		5.225	-5.225		3.42	-3.42		3.23	-3.23		2.565	-2.565		6.694	-6.694		10.08	-10.08		11.13	-11.13	2.14	5.86	-3.72
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	3.5	0.5	3	3.72	0.864	2.856	3.7	4.3	-0.6	3.9	3.9		4.17	0.63	3.54	4.116	0.6699	3.4461	4.1584	0.67	3.4884	4.36	0.8	3.56	5	1	4
i. Migrants' Transfers	3.5	0.5	3	3.72	0.864	2.856	3.7	0.7	3	3.9	0.5	3.4	4.17	0.63	3.54	4.116	0.6699	3.4461	4.1584	0.67	3.4884	4.36	0.8	3.56	5	1	4
ii. Other								3.6	-3.6		3.4	-3.4															
ECCB AREA																											
PRIVATE TRANSFERS:	229.47	74.68	154.79	271.04	76.445	194.6	266.69	76.34	190.35	356.36	64.82	291.54	333.34	93.393	239.95	299.76	84.959	214.8	297.61	102.9	194.71	296.45	130.77	165.68	343.87	114.61	229.26
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	180.76	39.58	141.18	215	46.051	168.95	209	46.1	162.9	303.17	53.72	249.45	270.12	81.382	188.74	235.82	74.849	160.97	231.12	90.867	140.25	228.84	117.31	111.53	265.32	104.05	161.27
a. Workers Remittances	180.76	17.1	163.66	213.79	23.446	190.34	206.56	23.16	183.4	283.82	31.555	252.27	255.52	51.54	203.98	230.9	42.739	188.16	228.05	45.74	182.31	223.86	54.622	169.24	243.37	50.381	192.99
b. Other Transfers		22.48	-22.48	1.21	22.605	-21.4	2.44	22.94	-20.5	19.35	22.165	-2.815	14.6	29.842	-15.24	4.92	32.11	-27.19	3.07	45.127	-42.06	4.98	62.687	-57.71	21.946	53.667	-31.72
B. CAPITAL TRANSFERS	48.71	35.1	13.61	56.04	30.394	25.646	57.69	30.24	27.45	53.188	11.1	42.088	63.217	12.011	51.206	63.939	10.11	53.829	66.489	12.028	54.461	67.61	13.458	54.152	78.553	10.563	67.99
i. Migrants' Transfers	48.71	30.5	18.21	56.04	25.494	30.546	57.69	25.24	32.45	53.188	5.5	47.688	63.217	12.011	51.206	63.939	10.11	53.829	66.489	12.028	54.461	67.61	13.458	54.152	78.553	10.563	67.99
ii. Other		4.6	-4.6		4.9	-4.9		5	-5		5.6	-5.6															

BARBADOS

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers	47.3	-9.6	37.7	59.6	-11.9	47.7	63.4	-10.7	52.7	79.9	-11.6	68.3	90.6	-20.2	70.4	97.8	-19.3	78.5	88.0	-19.7	68.3	101.1	-18.7	82.4	81.8	-29.6	52.2
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	47.3	-9.6	37.7	59.6	-11.9	47.7	63.4	-10.7	52.7	79.9	-11.6	68.3	90.6	-20.2	70.4	97.8	-19.3	78.5	88.0	-19.7	68.3	101.1	-18.7	82.4	81.8	-29.6	52.2
Workers Remittances	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	BA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other Transfers	47.3	-9.6	37.7	59.6	-11.9	47.7	63.4	-10.7	52.7	79.9	-11.6	68.3	90.6	-20.2	70.4	97.8	-19.3	78.5	88.0	-19.7	68.3	101.1	-18.7	82.4	81.8	-29.6	52.2
Capital Transfers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Migrant Transfers	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Other																											

THE BAHAMAS

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers	1.2	-15.8	-14.6	1.2	-15.2	-14.0	1.2	-19.0	-17.8	1.2	-30.1	-28.9	1.2	-19.1	-17.9	1.2	-11.8	-10.6	1.2	-9.0	-7.8	1.2	-14.0	-12.8	1.2	-13.8	-12.6
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	1.2	-13.3	-12.1	1.2	-13.7	-12.5	1.2	-17.3	-16.1	1.2	-27.1	-25.9	1.2	-16.4	-15.2	1.2	-7.6	-6.4	1.2	-6.1	-4.9	1.2	-9.8	-8.6	1.2	-9.4	-8.2
Workers Remittances	0.0	-13.3	-13.3		-13.7	-13.7		-17.3	-17.3		-27.1	-27.1		-16.4	-16.4		-7.6	-7.6		-6.1	-6.1		-9.8	-9.8		-9.4	-9.4
Other Transfers	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2		1.2
Capital Transfers	0.0	-2.5	-2.5	0.0	-1.5	-1.5	0.0	-1.7	-1.7	0.0	-3.0	-3.0	0.0	-2.7	-2.7	0.0	-4.2	-4.2	0.0	-2.9	-2.9	0.0	-4.2	-4.2	0.0	-4.4	-4.4
Migrant Transfers	0.0	0.0	0.0		-1.5	-1.5		-1.7	-1.7		-3.0	-3.0		-2.7	-2.7		-4.2	-4.2		-2.9	-2.9		-4.2	-4.2		-4.4	-4.4
Other																											

BELIZE

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers	20.8	-1.8	19.0	18.4	-3.0	15.4	17.6	-2.4	15.2	17.9	-2.7	15.2	23.1	-2.4	20.7	19.5	-3.2	16.3	18.3	-2.9	15.4	21.2	-3.5	17.7	16.2	-2.8	15.4
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	20.8	-1.8	19.0	18.4	-3.0	15.4	17.6	-2.4	15.2	17.9	-2.7	15.2	23.1	-2.4	20.7	19.5	-3.2	16.3	18.3	-2.9	15.4	21.2	-3.5	17.7	18.2	-2.8	15.4
Workers Remittances	19.8	-0.8	19.0	16.9	-0.9	16.0	15.9	-0.6	15.3	12.9	-0.5	12.4	17.9	-0.5	17.4	13.7	-0.7	13.0	12.3	-0.9	11.4	16.2	-1.3	14.9	13.1	-1.3	11.8
Other Transfers	1.0	-1.0	0.0	1.5	-2.1	-0.6	1.7	-1.8	-0.1	5.0	-2.2	2.8	5.2	-1.9	3.3	5.8	-2.5	3.3	6.0	-2.0	4.0	5.0	-2.2	2.8	5.1	-1.5	3.6
Capital Transfers	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant Transfers	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
Other																											

JAMAICA

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers	191.4	-38.2	153.2	141.3	-29.7	111.6	139.2	-22.0	117.2	160.1	-24.5	135.6	163.3	-28.1	135.2	184.2	-28.8	155.4	183.3	-30.0	153.3	285.2	-37.0	248.2	331.0	-24.6	306.4
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	191.4	-7.2	184.2	141.3	-7.4	133.9	139.2	-5.5	133.7	160.1	-9.1	151.0	163.3	-13.1	150.2	184.2	-12.9	171.3	183.3	-14.3	169.0	285.2	-19.4	265.8	331.0	-24.6	306.4
Workers Remittances	92.3	-4.3	88.0	54.0	-7.4	46.6	54.7	-1.1	53.6	76.0	-2.1	73.9	116.2	-2.1	114.1	136.2	-5.4	130.8	140.6	-5.6	135.0	159.0	-7.9	151.1	NA	NA	NA
Other Transfers	99.1	-2.9	96.2	87.3	0.0	87.3	84.5	-4.4	80.1	84.1	-7.0	77.1	47.1	-11.0	36.1	48.0	-7.5	40.5	42.7	-8.7	34.0	126.2	-11.5	114.7	331.0	-24.6	306.4
Capital Transfers	0.0	-31.0	-31.0	0.0	-22.3	-22.3	0.0	-16.5	-16.5	0.0	-15.4	-15.4	0.0	-15.0	-15.0	0.0	-15.9	-15.9	0.0	-15.7	-15.7	0.0	-17.6	-17.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant Transfers		-31.0	-31.0		-22.3	-22.3		-16.5	-16.5		-15.4	-15.4		-15.0	-15.0		-15.9	-15.9		-15.7	-15.7		-17.6	-17.6		NA	0.0
Other																											

TRINIDAD & TOBAGO

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers	3.3	-38.3	-35.0	0.8	-31.6	-30.8	2.5	-22.7	-20.2	2.1	-25.1	-23.0	3.7	-22.7	-19.0	3.7	-24.7	-21.0	5.4	-21.3	-15.9	6.8	-22.5	-15.7	NA	NA	-6.7
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.8	-10.1	-9.3	0.7	-6.7	-6.0	2.1	-4.7	-2.6	3.3	-5.2	-1.9	3.3	-5.1	-1.8	5.0	-4.8	0.2	6.4	-5.6	0.8	NA	NA	NA
Workers Remittances	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.7	0.0	1.7	2.9	0.0	2.9	3.0	0.0	3.0	4.8	0.0	4.8	6.2	0.0	6.2	NA	NA	NA
Other Transfers				0.6	-10.1	-9.5	0.4	-6.7	-6.3	0.4	-4.7	-4.3	0.4	-5.2	-4.8	0.3	-5.1	-4.8	0.2	-4.8	-4.6	0.2	-5.6	-5.4	NA	NA	NA
Capital Transfers	3.1	-38.3	-35.2	0.0	-21.5	-21.5	1.8	-16.0	-14.2	0.0	-20.4	-20.4	0.4	-17.5	-17.1	0.4	-19.6	-19.2	0.4	-16.5	-16.1	0.4	-16.9	-16.5	NA	NA	NA
Migrant Transfers	3.1	-38.3	-35.2	0.0	-21.5	-21.5	1.8	-16.0	-14.2	0.0	-20.4	-20.4	0.4	-17.5	-17.1	0.4	-19.6	-19.2	0.4	-16.5	-16.1	0.4	-16.9	-16.5	NA	NA	NA
Other																											

SURINAME

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers	4.9	-8.8	-3.9	5.2	-7.1	-1.9	5.4	-5.8	-0.4	2.6	-7.2	-4.6	1.7	-7.4	-5.7	1.4	-8.9	-7.5	3.5	-10.9	-7.4	7.1	-14.4	-7.3	NA	NA	NA
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS	2.9	-5.5	-2.6	4.3	-4.5	-0.2	4.3	-3.5	0.8	1.1	-4.2	-3.1	0.6	-4.7	-4.1	1.1	-5.8	-4.7	1.2	-7.5	-6.3	4.5	-8.6	-4.1	NA	NA	NA
Workers Remittances	0.0	-1.0	-1.0	0.0	-0.7	-0.7	0.0	-0.3	-0.3	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.0	-1.0	-1.0	0.0	-0.8	-0.8	NA	NA	NA
Other Transfers	2.9	-4.5	-1.6	4.3	-3.8	0.5	4.3	-3.2	1.1	1.1	-3.8	-2.7	0.6	-4.3	-3.7	1.1	-5.4	-4.3	1.2	-6.5	-5.3	4.5	-7.8	-3.3	NA	NA	NA
Capital Transfers	2.0	-3.3	-1.3	0.9	-2.6	-1.7	1.1	-2.3	-1.2	1.5	-3.0	-1.5	1.1	-2.7	-1.6	0.3	-3.1	-2.8	2.3	-3.4	-1.1	2.6	-5.8	-3.2	NA	NA	NA
Migrant Transfers	2.0	-3.3	-1.3	0.9	-2.6	-1.7	1.1	-2.3	-1.2	1.5	-3.0	-1.5	1.1	-2.7	-1.6	0.3	-3.1	-2.8	2.3	-3.4	-1.1	2.6	-5.8	-3.2	NA	NA	NA
Other																											

THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

	1985			1986			1987			1988			1989			1990			1991			1992			1993		
	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net	Credit	Debit	Net
Private Transfers				225.4	0.0	225.4	273.1	0.0	273.1	288.8	0.0	288.8	300.5	0.0	300.5	314.8	0.0	314.8	329.5	0.0	329.5	346.6	0.0	346.6	361.8	0.0	361.8
A. CURRENT TRANSFERS				225.4	0.0	225.4	273.1	0.0	273.1	288.8	0.0	288.8	300.5	0.0	300.5	314.8	0.0	314.8	329.5	0.0	329.5	346.6	0.0	346.6	361.8	0.0	361.8
Workers Remittances				225.4	0.0	225.4	273.1	0.0	273.1	288.8	0.0	288.8	300.5	0.0	300.5	314.8	0.0	314.8	329.5	0.0	329.5	346.6	0.0	346.6	361.8	0.0	361.8
Other Transfers				0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
Capital Transfers				0.0	0.0	4.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Migrant Transfers					0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0
Other																											

UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN
Subregional Headquarters for the Caribbean
CARIBBEAN DEVELOPMENT
AND COOPERATION COMMITTEE