

Based on the reasoning of Gordon, Steward and Gleeson JJ, I will reconstruct their chain of arguments into a formal modus ponens structure, leading to their final conclusion:

1. If the factual ingredients or elements of former s 66EA differ significantly from current s 66EA, then current s 66EA is a new offence. (Implied premise)

The factual ingredients or elements of former s 66EA differ significantly from current s 66EA. (Para 65)

Therefore, current s 66EA is a new offence. (Para 65)

2. If current s 66EA is a new offence, then s 19 of the Procedure Act does not apply to it. (Implied premise)

Current s 66EA is a new offence. (Conclusion from argument 1)

Therefore, s 19 of the Procedure Act does not apply to current s 66EA. (Para 65-66)

3. If s 19 of the Procedure Act does not apply to current s 66EA, then the maximum penalty for the offence under current s 66EA is life imprisonment. (Implied premise)

S 19 of the Procedure Act does not apply to current s 66EA. (Conclusion from argument 2)

Therefore, the maximum penalty for the offence under current s 66EA is life imprisonment. (Implied conclusion from paras 65-67)

4. If the maximum penalty for the offence under current s 66EA is life imprisonment, then the sentencing judge did not err in sentencing the appellant on that basis. (Implied premise)

The maximum penalty for the offence under current s 66EA is life imprisonment. (Conclusion from argument 3)

Therefore, the sentencing judge did not err in sentencing the appellant on the basis that the maximum penalty was life imprisonment. (Implied conclusion from paras 65-67)

5. If the sentencing judge did not err in sentencing the appellant on the basis that the maximum penalty was life imprisonment, then the appeal should be dismissed. (Implied premise)

The sentencing judge did not err in sentencing the appellant on the basis that the maximum penalty was life imprisonment. (Conclusion from argument 4)

Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed. (Para 69)

Final Conclusion: The appeal should be dismissed. (Para 69)

This chain of arguments reconstructs the reasoning of Gordon, Steward and Gleeson JJ, leading to their conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed. Each step in the argument is connected to the next, maintaining a logical flow to the final conclusion. The final conclusion reflects the culmination of the argument chain and includes the disposition of the case.