Based on the reasoning of Judges Gordon, Steward, and Gleeson JJ in the judgment, here is the chain of arguments reconstructed into a formal modus ponens structure:

1. **Premise 1 (P1):** If an act increases the penalty for an offence, the increased penalty only applies to offences committed after the commencement of that act.
   - **Reference:** Section 19(1) of the Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999 (NSW) (the Procedure Act) 【7:4†source】.

2. **Premise 2 (P2):** The appellant's offending occurred prior to the commencement of the current s 66EA of the Crimes Act.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 41 【7:4†source】.

3. **Conclusion 1 (C1):** Therefore, if the current s 66EA of the Crimes Act increases the penalty for the same offence, the increased penalty should not apply to the appellant's case.

4. **Premise 3 (P3):** The current s 66EA created a new and distinct offence from the former s 66EA.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 65 【7:9†source】.

5. **Premise 4 (P4):** The new s 66EA has different factual ingredients or elements and carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment, whereas the former s 66EA carried a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 65 【7:9†source】.

6. **Conclusion 2 (C2):** Therefore, the current s 66EA does not constitute an increase in the penalty for the "offence" already created by the former s 66EA.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 66 【7:9†source】.

7. **Premise 5 (P5):** Section 19 of the Procedure Act does not apply to new offences created after its enactment.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 66 【7:9†source】.

8. **Conclusion 3 (C3):** Therefore, the appellant cannot rely on s 19 of the Procedure Act to argue that the penalty for the offence should be limited to the maximum penalty under the former s 66EA.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 66 【7:9†source】.

9. **Premise 6 (P6):** The appellant was sentenced under the current s 66EA, which applies retrospectively and carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 58 【7:18†source】.

10. **Conclusion 4 (C4):** Therefore, the appellant's sentence of eight years imprisonment, considering the maximum penalty of life imprisonment, was valid.
   - **Reference:** Conclusion from multiple paragraphs confirming the application and reasoning【7:9†source】【7:18†source】.

11. **Final Conclusion (C5):** The appeal should be dismissed as the new s 66EA was correctly applied, and the appellant's sentence was appropriate under the law.
   - **Reference:** Paragraph 69【7:2†source】【7:10†source】.

This structure logically connects the premises and conclusions to build the overall argument leading to the dismissal of the appeal.